

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses

12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
a1	6/28/2013	Arroyo Seco Foundation	1. Lack of Public Process and Involvement -- The most serious deficiency of the 2013 Draft Plan Update is the lack of public process and involvement in developing the plan and in the activities and programs of the GLAC IRWMP itself. There has been extremely limited input from stakeholders in the GLAC territory and no meaningful public hearings or educational events related to the plan and to the goals and programs of IRWMP in our region. Ambitious plans such as this require the participation and buy-in of the public in general, as well as of the agencies and stakeholders in the process, and this can best be achieved by involving the public, the agencies and stakeholders in the planning process, but this has not been done. Instead consultants, working with only limited input from a small, select group of insiders, have drafted this Plan Update. While the Draft Plan Update outlines a more integrated approach to water management for the next twenty years, it fails to present basic information regarding possible solutions and the costs and benefits of those solutions and to inspire the public support for it. This is a severe flaw that will limit its impact on adopting solutions that make sense, are good for the communities involved, and are economically and politically feasible.	Thank you for taking the time to submit comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. We welcome feedback on ways to include the public in future IRWM Plan updates. This Plan is developed in response to a grant funding opportunity, and as such, is atypical of most planning efforts, since the document is developed in the spirit of cooperation, rather than to exercise legal authority. Nevertheless, the subregional and Leadership Committee meetings are open to the public, and attendance is welcomed and encouraged. Meeting information will be posted on <a href="http://www.lawaterplan.org">www.lawaterplan.org</a> .
a2	6/28/2013	same as above	2. Lack of Program Review and Accountability -- The Draft Plan Update lacks a clear vision of program oversight and accountability, one of the most critical components of a successful water management plan. There have been attempts at Leadership Committee meetings to create a platform for measuring progress made by GLAC IRWMP towards water quality, water supply, flood control, etc., but no complete program has been outlined as of yet. This leaves us in the position of updating our IRWMP plan without a solid understanding of the effectiveness of the current plan. Strategic planning for the future always must start from an analysis of current conditions and programs, but the 2013 Draft Plan does not provide any meaningful analysis of the past seven years of GLAC IRWMP activity. There is no list or analysis of the grants in the initial Proposition 50 round of funding from many years ago, nor is there a list of the Proposition 84 grants, which are referred to as Round One of GLAC funding, nor of the projects that are included in the most recent selection round and application, now being evaluated by the California Department of Water Resources.	Performance of the IRWMP-funded projects will take place as projects are completed. The results are provided to the Department of Water Resources in the final report that is submitted upon project completion. A more thorough analysis of project performance is not feasible with the current resources. Also, a list of all projects that have been funded by Proposition 50 and Proposition 84 to date can be found in the Preface.
a3	6/28/2013	same as above	3. Governance -- While a key aspect of IRWMP is broadening the involvement of the public and stakeholders in water management decision-making, the GLAC program has not made significant efforts to educate or involve the public and stakeholders in the planning and decision process. The governance structure illustrates this deficiency. The GLAC Leadership Committee is composed of a narrow group of agencies and is not broadly representative of Los Angeles County. There are no public representatives or representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on the Leadership Committee, and there has been only limited participation from NGOs on the sub-regional committees, which have only limited authority. In three rounds of funding, GLAC has not made any grants available directly to NGOs. The current governance structure and the Draft Plan Update fail to meet the IRWMP goal of broadening public participation and support for water management programs. ASF proposes that three members should be added to the Leadership Committee to represent the public in general, stakeholders and non-governmental organizations.	The Council for Watershed Health does represent an NGO on the Leadership Committee and has received a grant. Other NGOs have partnered on IRWMP funded projects. In addition, remaining Leadership Committee members represent the public through various local and state government agencies and special districts. All decisions are made with the public's best interest in mind.
a4	6/28/2013	same as above	4. Integration with Stormwater and Water Quality Programs -- A critical gap in the Draft Plan Update is failure to include the impacts of the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board last December. A parallel and disconnected process is now going on in which many of the same agencies involved in GLAC IRWMP are developing Watershed Management Programs and Enhanced Watershed Management Programs. Many of these agencies anticipate that some of the funding for their programs will come from the IRWMP process, but the Draft Plan fails to adequately deal with the impacts of the MS4 program on GLAC IRWMP developments in the next period of time. The goals and objectives outlined in the MS4 permit are similar and related to those of IRWMP. Cooperation and integration of these programs would be very beneficial to MS4 permittees and to IRWMP stakeholders. The Plan Update should address this issue directly.	Discussion on the MS4 permit was included in section Section 4 Regional Water Management (Water Quality discussion), Section 5 Integrated Regional Projects (Project Integration discussion), and in the Water Quality TM. We agree that the MS4 permit provides exciting opportunities for integration. We expect a lot of interest and excitement about IRWMP as permittees develop their Watershed Management Programs.
a5	6/28/2013	same as above	5. Disadvantaged Communities -- There is no dedicated section on Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) in the Draft Plan Update. DAC is a component of IRWMP that needs significantly more focus and attention. Los Angeles County contains massive pockets of disadvantaged communities that have special problems and needs, often related to urban service and quality of life issues. The GLAC IRWMP needs to consider more carefully how to make sure the DAC communities are informed of the IRWMP goals and objectives and get fair treatment in project selection. An inadequately-funded part-time outreach worker is not a sufficient program to meet the needs of the disadvantaged communities of Los Angeles County.	The Disadvantaged Communities section is included in Section 1 and has been enhanced in the final version. Also, a final project report for the DAC Outreach pilot project is scheduled for completion in late 2013. It will provide a full description of activities that were conducted as part of that project.
a6	6/28/2013	same as above	6. Flood and Sediment Management -- The 2013 Plan Update includes a planning target of removing 68 million cubic yards of sediment from the debris basins and reservoirs of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, but this goal has not been part of the IRWMP discussions or process up to this point. The solution to the enormous problem of sediment buildup in flood facilities has got to be more comprehensive than simply trucking away 68 million cubic yards of sediment at a cost likely to exceed \$3 billion in the next twenty years, draining public resources for other important programs. It is time to review the hundred-year-old approach to flood and sediment in Los Angeles and realistically assess the environmental impacts and unanticipated maintenance costs of the program. Taking a look at sediment from a regional water management perspective would provide the best means of attacking the problem, but a blanket statement calling for removal of sediment from debris basins and reservoirs is superficial and self-serving on the part of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District. The language put forward in Appendix G, which calls for a multipurpose, integrated planning approach to sediment, flood control, water quality and water supply is a step in the right direction. A more appropriate target for the 2013 Plan Update would be to achieve sustainable sediment management operations that benefit not only flood control goals, but ecological processes, water supply, water quality and hydrological goals, including reclaiming much of the historic floodplain.	We agree that a more integrated approach to sediment removal is needed. The Los Angeles County Flood Control District is currently undertaking a study to manage sediment throughout its facilities. This Master Plan was completed in March 2013. You can visit <a href="http://dpw.lacounty.gov/lactcd/sediment/">http://dpw.lacounty.gov/lactcd/sediment/</a> for more information.
a7	6/28/2013	same as above	7. Project Selection -- A major missing component of the 2013 GLAC IRWMP Plan Update is a review and analysis of project selection. IRWMP in Los Angeles County is not yet a planning program that oversees and integrates water program development. Instead the GLAC Leadership Committee reviews the program proposals of local and regional agencies without clear policies of ethics and conflict of interest. The current method of project selection heavily favors massive projects by agencies that are likely to happen with or without IRWMP funding. The IRWMP funding may require a new element of these existing projects, such as landscaping or a public trail, but often the elements are pasted on and not truly integrated. The GLAC funding process should be more focused on appropriately sized projects that represent a new, integrated and regional approach to water management, emphasizing partnerships and sustainability. The lack of involvement of the public and of non-governmental organizations in the decision-making process is a major roadblock to objectively and fairly selecting the most integrated and deserving projects.	The project review process in the GLAC IRWMP was developed using the Project Review Process Plan Standard outlined in DWR's 2012 Guidelines. Because of the size, complexity, and diversity of the GLAC Region, subregions are in the best position to prioritize projects. Therefore, subregional Steering Committees will take the lead in prioritizing projects within their areas.
a8	6/28/2013	same as above	8. The OPTI Project Database -- In addition to not being publicly accessible, the OPTI database used by GLAC IRWMP has been a headache for many agencies and stakeholders. It is also a roadblock for adding potentially important integrated projects to the GLAC IRWMP. OPTI was a system created by a consultant as a "bonus," and GLAC IRWMP has not made the investment necessary to improve the system. GLAC IRWMP needs to plan and implement a publically-accessible database system that can track proposed and existing projects, as well as the progress of overall IRWMP goals, targets, priorities and objectives. The 2013 Draft Plan Update should address this need in a more forthright way, acknowledging the deficiencies of the current system.	The GLAC intends on enhancing the project database and making it more accessible to the public. We recognize that the project database does not easily allow for integration of projects and that this will take place during the subregional Steering Committee discussions.
b1	6/27/2013	Central Basin Municipal Water District	As a member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Gateway Region, the Central Basin Municipal Water District, respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013. 1. Please delete all references to Central Basin Municipal Water District in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update. 2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 -- "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group", as defined in and authorized by the IRWMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement -- "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group", to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs", and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies", as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMPA..." Paragraph #3 of Agreement -- "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this Agreement." 3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan. - The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies. 4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG", we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG. 5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region. 6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document. Central Basin Municipal Water District appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us to all move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions	Thank you for taking the time to submit comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. When the GLAC IRWMP region was formed out of several disparate IRWM planning efforts in the Los Angeles Basin in 2005, 5 subregions were established with their own Steering Committees, including the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers subregion. During the development of the 2006 adopted IRWM Plan and throughout the first two years of the IRWM planning activities in the GLAC Region, each of the subregional planning areas benefitted from the widespread participation of agencies, municipalities, organizations, and many individuals from within the subregions. In 2008, several cities in the Lower SG & LA Subregion elected to form a Joint Powers Authority (Gateway JPA) for the purpose of conducting more detailed local water resource planning in the Gateway region. While this effort resulted in a decline in participation in the Lower SG & LA Subregional Steering Committee, the Agencies and stakeholders that elected to not join the JPA have continued to meet and plan for the needs of this subregion, and have always welcomed participation by any stakeholder in the subregion, including members of the Gateway JPA. In June 2008, in a letter from DWR Director Lester Snow, DWR encouraged the GLAC Region and members of the Gateway JPA to work together to resolve issues and concerns. The GLAC Region continues to welcome the participation of members of the Gateway JPA in GLAC's IRWM planning efforts, and believes that the most effective approach to addressing the water resource management needs of the residents of the GLAC Region would be for these IRWM planning activities to merge their planning efforts.
c1	6/27/2013	City of Artesia	As a member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of Artesia, respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013. 1. Please delete all references to the City of Artesian the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update. 2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 -- "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group", as defined in and authorized by the IRWMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement -- "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group", to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs", and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies", as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMPA..." Paragraph #3 of Agreement -- "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this Agreement." 3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan. - The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies. 4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG", we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG. 5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region. 6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document. City of Artesia appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us to all move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions	Please see response b1.

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses  
12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
d1	6/26/2013	City of Bell	<p>As a member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of Bell, respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to City of Bell in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group", as defined in and authorized by the IRWMMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group", to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs", and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies", as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMMPA..." Paragraph #3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this Agreement."</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan. - The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG", we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>City of Bell appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us to all move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions</p>	Please see response b1.
e1	5/22/2013	City of Commerce	<p>As a Member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of Commerce respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to City of Commerce in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group", as defined in and authorized by the IRWMMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group," to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs," and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies," as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMMPA..." Paragraph #3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this Agreement."</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan. - The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG", we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>The City appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us to all move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues</p>	Please see response b1.
f1	6/28/2013	City of Cudahy	<p>As a Member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of Cudahy respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to City of Cudahy in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group", as defined in and authorized by the IRWMMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group," to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs," and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies," as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMMPA..." Paragraph #3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this Agreement."</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan. - The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG", we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>The City of Cudahy appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us to all move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions</p>	Please see response b1.

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses  
12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
g1	6/17/2013	City of Downey	<p>As a Member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of Downey respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to City of Downey in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group", as defined in and authorized by the IRWMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group," to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs," and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies," as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMPA..." Paragraph #3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this Agreement."</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan. - The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG", we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>The City of Downey appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us to all move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions</p>	Please see response b1.
h1	6/20/2013	City of Hawaiian Gardens	<p>As a Member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of Hawaiian Gardens respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to City of Hawaiian Gardens in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group", as defined in and authorized by the IRWMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group," to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs," and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies," as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMPA..." Paragraph #3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this Agreement."</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan. - The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG", we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>City of Hawaiian Gardens appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us to all move forward as adjoining regions working together</p>	Please see response b1.
i1	5/29/2013	City of Lakewood	<p>As a member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of Lakewood respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to the "City of Lakewood" in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group", as defined in and authorized by the IRWMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group," to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs," and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies," as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMPA..." Paragraph #3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this agreement."</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. • In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. • In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan. • The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG", we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>The City of Lakewood appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us all to move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions.</p>	Please see response b1.
j1	6/28/2013	City of Long Beach	<p>As a member of the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) for the Gateway Region, the City of Long Beach, respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to the City of Long Beach in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. The City is a participant in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The Gateway Watershed Management Authority (GWMA) serves as the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Agreement. It is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member city and agency becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region.</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is already in charge of planning for the Gateway Region, which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region.</li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments (Gateway COG), Long Beach has had no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>The City of Long Beach appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us to all move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions</p>	Please see response b1.
k1	NA	City of Malibu	Various edits within sections of Plan. Provided as part of Plan Update Committee meetings.	Comments/edits incorporated and/or Noted

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses

12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
l1	6/27/2013	City of Montebello	<p>As a member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of Montebello respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to the Montebello in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group," as defined in and authorized by the IRWMMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group," to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs," and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies," as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMMPA..." Paragraph #3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this agreement."</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region.</li> <li>• In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan.</li> <li>• The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG," we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>The City of Montebello appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us all to move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions.</p> <p>Please contact Mr. Samuel T. Kouri, PE Deputy City Engineer with any technical questions or requests for information.</p>	Please see response b1.
m1	5/23/2013	City of Norwalk	<p>As a Member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of Norwalk respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to City of Norwalk in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group", as defined in and authorized by the IRWMMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group," to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs," and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies," as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMMPA..." Paragraph #3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this Agreement."</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region.</li> <li>• In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan.</li> <li>• The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG," we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>The City of Norwalk appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us to all move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions</p>	Please see response b1.
n1	5/23/2013	City of Paramount	<p>As a member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of Paramount respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to City of Paramount in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group," as defined in and authorized by the IRWMMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group," to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs," and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies," as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMMPA..." Paragraph #3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this agreement."</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region.</li> <li>• In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan.</li> <li>• The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG," we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>The City of Paramount appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us all to move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions.</p>	Please see response b1.
o1	6/27/2013	City of Santa Fe Springs	<p>As a member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of Santa Fe Springs respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to Santa Fe Springs in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group," as defined in and authorized by the IRWMMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group," to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs," and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies," as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMMPA..." Paragraph #3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this agreement."</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region.</li> <li>• In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan.</li> <li>• The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG," we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>Santa Fe Springs appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us all to move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions.</p>	Please see response b1.

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses  
12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
p1	6/25/2013	City of Signal Hill	<p>As a member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of Signal Hill respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to City of Signal Hill in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group," as defined in and authorized by the IRWMMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group," to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs," and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies," as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMMPA..."</li> <li>Paragraph #3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this agreement."</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region.</li> <li>• In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan.</li> <li>• The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG," we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>The City of Signal Hill appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us all to move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions.</p>	Please see response b1.
q1	6/19/2013	City of South Gate	<p>As a member of the Regional Water Management Group "RWWMG" for the Gateway Region, the City of South Gate respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please delete all references to the City of South Gate in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. We have participated in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. We are not participating as a stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group," as defined in and authorized by the IRWMMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group," to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs," and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies," as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMMPA..."</li> <li>Paragraph #3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this agreement."</li> <li>3. Please delete all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region.</li> <li>• In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan.</li> <li>• The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments "COG," we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>The City of South Gate appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. We urge you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us all to move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions.</p>	Please see response b1.
r1	6/10/2013	City of Vernon	<p>As a member of the Regional Water Management Group (RWWMG) for the Gateway Region, the City of Vernon (City), respectfully submits the following comments on the GLAC's IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please remove all references to City in the text and maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan. The City is an active participant in the Gateway Region IRWM Plan process. The City is not a participating stakeholder in GLAC's 2013 Plan Update.</li> <li>2. The Gateway Water Management Authority (GWMA) serves as the Regional Water Management Group (RWWMG) for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region which is required by the IRWM program. The GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital No. 3 — "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group", as defined in and authorized by the IRWMMP, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMMP, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph No. 2 of Agreement — "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group", to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs", and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies", as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMMP."</li> <li>Paragraph No. 3 of Agreement — "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this Agreement."</li> <li>3. Please remove all references in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources (DWR) approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region.</li> <li>• In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan.</li> <li>• The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. As a member of the Gateway Council of Governments (COG), we have no knowledge of coordination with the Gateway COG for purposes of planning. Please delete references to the Gateway COG.</li> <li>5. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and its member cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region.</li> <li>6. Please refer any planning activities and projects within our region to GWMA for inclusion in their IRWM Plan document.</li> </ol> <p>The City appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013. The City urges you to acknowledge the Gateway Region as an independent planning region without any overlap. This will enable us to all move forward as adjoining regions working together on common issues and solutions.</p>	Please see response b1.
s1	6/19/2013	City of Whittier	<p>The City of Whittier appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013.</p> <p>Whittier is a member of the Gateway Water Management Authority (GWMA) which recently prepared and adopted the Gateway IRWM of June 2013. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group (RWWMG) for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region. The GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board. The City of Whittier respectfully requests that the GLAC Leadership Committee and its IRWMMP acknowledge the independent jurisdiction and work of the GWMA.</p> <p>This will require that the GLAC IRWM Plan Update 2013 be revised to omit references to the City of Whittier, other GWMA members, and the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers region since we are not participating stakeholders in the GLAC 2013 Plan Update. Any reference to this region and its cities should specifically identify the GWMA and our Gateway IRWM of June 2013 as the legitimate planning effort for this region.</p>	Please see response b1.
t1	5/14/2013	Collin O-Reilly	<p>I am very concerned about the creation of what appears to be a very bureaucratic and expensive management system to harness the effective water needs of the people living in the LA County.</p> <p>I own approximately 20 acres of land adjacent a dry river bed. I only use 7 acres preferring to keep the balance in the river bed as a watershed. I own no pesticides, chemicals or similar.</p> <p>So, where is the consideration for the actual use of the land and the saving of water? We already pay a water fee in the property taxes and yet we receive no benefit from such tax. The actual pollution comes from the commercial use of the land and the nature of businesses who cause much of the pollution and problems associated with such matters.</p> <p>I cannot support a system which attempts to control the water rights of the minority stakeholder, taxing the average land owner for residential private use so that the companies who cause much of the destruction can avoid responsibility.</p>	Thank you for taking the time to submit comments on the Draft GLAC IRWM update 2013, and congratulations for good stewardship of the watershed. We would like to note that the IRWMMP Act was established to encourage integrated regional strategies for management of water resources and to provide state funding for implementation projects that support integrated water management, and as such, the GLAC IRWMMP Region has no authority to make land use decisions, allocate water rights, or collect tax dollars.
u1	NA	Council for Watershed Health	<p>Various edits within sections of Plan. Provided as part of Plan Update Committee meetings.</p>	Comments/edits Incorporated and/or Noted

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses  
12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
v1	6/26/2013	Enrique Huerta	Pg. 1-16: The Disadvantaged Community Outreach section is too small. There are less than three pages dedicated to these on-going efforts. In order for the DAC subcommittee to improve their participatory efforts, shape multi-benefit projects and produce projects in a bottom-up approach, feedback from efforts is of the essence. I support the consolidation (for example, the discussions in the Ch.6 Intro) and creation of a stand-alone chapter either titled DAC or Environmental Justice. For a good example of this section, refer to the seventeen page chapter dedicated in the SAWPA. This chapter can be found at <a href="http://www.sawpa.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Chapter-5.10-Final-OC-Comments-11-30-2010.pdf">http://www.sawpa.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Chapter-5.10-Final-OC-Comments-11-30-2010.pdf</a>	Thank you for taking the time to submit comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. The final DAC Outreach pilot project will be finalized in late 2013 and posted on the <a href="http://www.lawaterplan.org">www.lawaterplan.org</a> website. Comments Incorporated and/or Noted
v2	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-16: What is the relationship between DACs and the GLAC IRWM Proposition 84 Planning Grant? How will the 2013 plan update increase DAC participation in the IRWM process? What engagement frameworks are available?	The GLAC Region welcomes feedback as to how to increase DAC participation in the future. This comment will be considered as part of ongoing efforts to reach out to DACs. Please see response v1.
v3	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-16: How will Climate Change mitigation and adaptation strategies conflict or affect DACs? What are social scientists saying about the potential ramifications of mitigation strategies on environmental justice in DACs?	The GLAC Region welcomes feedback on how to address climate change mitigation and adaption strategies within the DACs. This Plan update addresses climate change and the need for adaptation strategies in the GLAC Region. We did not attempt to differentiate between DACs and non-DACs as the impacts and strategies needed are more defined by climate and geography than by socioeconomic status.
v4	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-16: Please consider defining the term Disadvantaged Community. One possibility for a DAC could be: "Disadvantaged Community" is a term defined by the California Public Resources Code (PRC), Section 75005(g)2: "Disadvantaged community" means a community with a median household income less than 80 % of the statewide average. "Severely disadvantaged community" means a community with a median household income less than 60% of the statewide average.	See section 1.5, Disadvantaged Community Outreach for further details.
v5	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-16: Also consider defining the term Outreach. One possibility could be: the term "outreach" means a mutual engagement. Outreach is herein defined as a process of exchange between a Project Initiator and community members, resulting in a meaningful understanding of issues facing the Project Initiator by community members, and the same understanding of community members' priorities and interests by the Project Initiator.	Already defined under Disadvantaged Community Outreach section: "Outreach is defined as a meaningful exchange between project initiators, project implementers and members of DACs."
v6	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-16: I think it would also be a good idea to define the roles of a 1) Project Initiator; 2) Active Community Members; 3) DAC Subcommittee; 4) DAC Technical Advisory Committee; and, 5) Technical Consultants.	DAC subcommittee and DAC Coordinator are defined already. We did not feel the need to define the others listed in your comment.
v7	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-16: Please delineate how the DAC boundaries are developed. Are they produced using Census data, windshield surveys, etc.? What was the methodology? Additionally, the leadership committee adopted the plan in October 2008, identifying "outreach to disadvantaged communities as one of [the GLAC-IRWM leadership committee's] highest priorities." The plan recognizes that outreach must be conducted at the sub-regional steering committee level but that resources were not available to fund much of the work. Consider extracting language discussing this from Chapter 7 (p. 7-13) and inserting it in the stand-alone DAC or Environmental Justice Chapter.	The boundaries were developed by using U.S. Census data and applied according to the DWR definition of a DAC. The outreach efforts were conducted through field research investigation and interviews.
v8	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-17: The section bullet-pointing the names of five projects being worked on by the Council for Watershed Health do not provide a project scope. You go on to mention that 'as a result of this process, four projects were identified for consideration during the Region's November 2012 Prop. 84 Round 2 Implementation Grant Application project selection process.' What were the selected projects? The DAC section does not mention anything about the extensive outreach conducted by USACE, Tetra Tech and the Council for Watershed Health in the City of Maywood (2011 through 2012). This outreach and the feedback gained from the Pilot Outreach Assessment is critically important, since it will ensure that the output of the needs assessment is integrated into future planning and project prioritization by the DAC technical advisory committee.	This section was intentionally streamlined to keep in line with the context of the other sections of the Plan Update. For more detailed analysis of the extensive DAC outreach project, the full report will be available in late 2013 on the <a href="http://www.lawaterplan.org">www.lawaterplan.org</a> website.
v9	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-18: A nice map (Maps 1-3 & 2-15) of the DACs within the LA County region. However, this does little to help readers understand how this fits into the overall "potential multiple benefits" matrix. A good way to visualize DACs is to reduce the size of the maps. One possibility is to further reduce the scale by creating one map per city showing each city boundary with the DAC tracts/blocks. These individual city maps should also contain the potential multiple benefits overlay (refer to Maps 5-2 through 5-6).	While very detailed mapping is useful, the suggested maps would be more appropriate in the DAC Outreach Plan, not the IRWM Plan which is a broad-based planning document for the entire region in which details such as this are not able to be included.
v10	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-19: The following sentence is repeated twice in the same paragraph: COGs and municipal agencies have advocated for their respective local planning needs and issues, which have been incorporated into the IRWMP.	Text modified.
v11	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-22: A paragraph on this page mentions that 'it should be further noted that municipal stormwater managers and water managers work closely with their planning departments in the review of development proposals.' However, the LA County Department of Planning is the only planning entity identified as part of the North Santa Monica Bay Steering Committee members list (Table 1-1). How is one planning entity working closely with other much smaller municipal planning departments? Maybe a definition of a municipal planning department is needed. While you're at it, please define land use planning, too (the plan describes, but does not define LU in Ch. 4). That is a term that is often used interchangeably with stormwater planning/habitat planning throughout the update.	This was expanded upon in Section 4 of the North Santa Monica Bay Subregional Plan and Section 7.5 of the GLAC Plan Update.
v12	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-24: Improved Outreach section does not describe how the DAC boundaries were designed. What was your methodology?	See section 1.5, Disadvantaged Community Outreach for further details.
v13	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-25: Table 1-3: Technical Analysis does not reference the methodologies used for producing the improved outreach to DACs or other stakeholders.	The methodologies used for producing the improved outreach to DACs will be included in the DAC Outreach Plan.
v14	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-1: In the Overview section, the plan mentions that the GLAC Region contains portions of four counties (LA, Ventura, San Bernardino and Orange). This is a bit confusing. I thought the scope of this update focused on LA County alone. Does this imply that the GLAC IRWMP takes precedent over other and smaller IRWMPs adopted in the region? In addition, Map 2-2 does not show the LA County (and neighboring counties) boundary. What does the regional boundary look like in relation to said county boundaries?	The GLAC Region is based on watersheds and not by county boundaries. The Region includes portions of 4 counties and 92 cities. Maps 2-5(a) through 2-5(c) depict the county and city boundaries within each of the five Subregions.
v15	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-67: In the Climate change section, please define the term adaptation measures.	See Table 4-3 in Chapter 4.
v16	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-70: It would be good information to elaborate as to why long-term conservation efforts have not generated overall cost savings to those customers. What kind of long-term conservation strategies are you talking about? Are they structural or non-structural changes?	This is a policy level discussion that is not under the authority of the GLAC Region to resolve. Refer to Urban Water Management Plans for more information.
v17	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-70: I think a discussion about the potential environmental justice (the siting of new water reclamation plants or an increase in manufacturing capacities by existing water polluting facilities) impacts associated with climate change mitigation measures are apt here. How will structural changes to the landscape (i.e., increased production of materials for the construction of mitigation structures) impact existing DACs? Will this increase in production exacerbate existing water quality and supply issues in DACs?	The GLAC IRWM Plan is not intended to address detailed planning issues, nor does the GLAC Region have the authority or capacity to address them.
v18	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 3-2: Table 3-1, GLAC Objectives and Targets: Consider adding a "DAC" column to reflect the objective of not exacerbating the water supply and quality issues in DACs due to an increase in structural solutions being proposed mitigate CC. This is a good opportunity to strengthen the plans commitment to avoid conflicts with environmental justice.	The GLAC Plan Update does not address locations of future facilities for CC mitigation.
v19	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 3-4: Consider inserting the ending to this statement (in italics): <i>A number of common urban runoff-associated pollutants, (for instance bacteria, metals and nutrients) have been found to directly impact human and/or ecosystem health. These impacts may lead to significant economic costs in terms of health care, loss of productivity and will impact DACs disproportionately.</i>	Text has been added.
v20	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 3-5: Consider adding the following (in italics) to this section: <i>In addition to adaptation, the Region also recognizes the importance of trying to mitigate against further climate change increases, avoiding conflicts with existing environmental justice issues that will inevitably disproportionately impact DACs, and by working to reduce energy consumption thereby decreasing GHG emissions.</i>	Text has been added.
v21	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 3-6: Consider adding the sentence following this statement (in italics): <i>It has been estimated that the Region's groundwater resources could provide an additional 97,000 AFY through groundwater treatment or through the construction or improvement of additional wells. However, it is important to recognize and avoid conflicts with environmental justice issues like water quality/supply and others emanating from the construction of new facilities or increased industrial discharges in DACs. Exacerbating these issues could be counter-productive to on-going engagement efforts in DACs.</i>	Comment Noted.
v22	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 4-4: Consider adding the following statement (in italics): <i>Other challenges to the expanded use of desalination in the Region include the following: disposal of saline discharge water (or brine) which, from inland locations, typically requires a pipeline and ocean outfall; the output of impaired water into the ocean and its effects on marine biology; . . . .</i>	Text has been added.
v23	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 4-26: Land use is a tricky concept. For planners working in planning departments, land use is typically regulated by zoning laws. Zoning laws emanate from the Land Use Element, but do not address or deal with water supply of quality. Please consider changing the word "Use" in the following statement and replace it with "development" (in italics): The Government Code establishes requirements for the development of General Plans to guide land development decisions, which must include seven required elements: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety.	Text has been added.

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses

12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
v24	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 5-9: Maps 5-2 through 5-6. Please consider a DAC overlay on all of these maps (and the legend). It would be beneficial to identify multiple benefit projects in DACs.	These are just samples showing multi-benefit project areas. During the project development and selection process for a grant program, benefits to DAC areas will be considered. See Appendix B for criteria for inclusion of projects in the IRWM Plan including addressing whether there are specific benefits to DAC community water issues.
v25	6/26/2013	same as above	Pg. 6-3: Table 6-1. The Potential Impacts column for the creation of additional pumping potential should address potential conflicts with the siting of new Water Reclamation Plants or increase in industrial discharges in DACs, since groundwater in these areas has historically been disproportionately impaired. We wouldn't want to exacerbate the extraction/recharge cycle.	Addressed in first paragraph in chapter.
w1	5/24/2013	Foothill MWD	Please add "Foothill Municipal Water District" to the ULAR bulleted list of Subregional Steering Committee Members. Also, there exists an empty bullet point in this column (at the end) of the table as well.	Thank you for taking the time to submit comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. Text has been added.
w2	5/24/2013	same as above	Please change the title of this project to FMWD Recycled Water Project. Also, the ultimate capacity of the project is currently estimated at 318 AFY.	Text has been added.
w3	5/24/2013	same as above	Foothill MWD is not the agency that owns or operates the La-Canada Flintridge Country Club RWP. LACSD is the owner and operator. Foothill MWD has only one planned RWP (Table 4) and that is the Foothill MWD Recycled Water Project, with a capacity for 318 AFY and is slated for completion by 2016.	Edit incorporated.
x1	6/11/2013	Gateway Cities COG	The Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) represents the 27 cities located in Southeastern Los Angeles County, serving a population base of 2.1 million persons. The Port of Long Beach and the County of Los Angeles are also members of our joint powers authority. The GCCOG is the regional planning entity for our communities. The GCCOG also sponsored the Gateway Water Management Authority, which is the regional organization tasked with preparing our Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP). We are respectfully submitting the following comments on behalf of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (COG) relative to the GLAC's draft IRWMP In 2007, the GCCOG recognized that water-related issues in our region's watersheds were critical to the vitality of our economy and environment. To that end, the GCCOG endorsed the plan that a separate joint powers authority be formed to solely focus on integrating our region's watershed plan. Within one year of that action, several cities and agencies formed the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Joint Powers Authority, also known as the Gateway Water Management Authority (GWMA). The GWMA has grown to 23 members and is actively facilitating and assisting in many watershed related programs and projects. We strongly support the GWMA in all of its activities. We only recognize GWMA as the Regional Water Management Group for our region. We do not support the inclusion of our region in the GLAC IRWM Plan Update and your document should be revised to reflect this. 1. Please delete any reference to the GCCOG within the GLAC IRWM Plan Update. Coordination with the GCCOG is being coordinated by the GWMA. We have not engaged or participated with GLAC or its consultants on watershed planning efforts for our disadvantaged communities or on any other activity related to your IRWM planning efforts. 2. References in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region should be deleted. The GWMA is authorized to plan for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. 3. References in the text or maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to any Gateway region city or stakeholder should be deleted. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region, as required by the IRWM program. We appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update. We look forward to coordinating GWMA's planning efforts with GLAC's efforts as adjacent, cooperating planning areas in Los Angeles County.	Please see response b1.
y1	5/21/2013	Gateway Water Management Authority	On behalf of the Gateway Water Management Authority "GWMA", I respectfully submit the following comments: In general, these comments relate to the inappropriateness of GLAC to plan for the Gateway Region. It is a wasteful duplication of effort and costs for the local and state taxpayers. GLAC's IRWM Plan includes a sub-region called "Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Sub Region". This area covers most of the Gateway Region which has just completed its own IRWM Plan. Adoption of this Plan by the GWMA and its stakeholders is expected in June through August of 2013. 1. References in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers sub-region should be deleted. The GWMA is in charge of planning for the Gateway Region which is inclusive of the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles region. - In 2009, the State Department of Water Resources "DWR" approved the jurisdictional boundaries of the Gateway area of Los Angeles as a separate Gateway planning region. - In 2010, DWR approved a \$950,000 grant to the Gateway Region to develop an IRWM Plan. - The Grant required a 25% local match which was paid by the GWMA Member Cities and Water Agencies. 2. References in the text or maps contained in the GLAC IRWM Plan that relate to all of its member cities and agencies including the Central Basin Municipal Water District and the Long Beach Water Department should be deleted throughout the document. The GWMA serves as the Regional Water Management Group "RWMG" for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River region, as required by the IRWM program. GWMA is governed under the authority of a Joint Powers Authority "JPA" Agreement and is a legally recognized public body with a governing board, made up of one voting member from each signatory. By signing the JPA, each member becomes a part of the RWMG in the Gateway Region. Excerpts from the JPA are as follows: Recital #3 - "It is the intent of the Members in entering into this Agreement to create a "regional water management group", as defined in and authorized by the IRWMPA, in order to create a regional water resources management plan that will protect and enhance regional water supplies, and to otherwise further the purposes of the IRWMPA, with respect to the Members' jurisdictional areas (collectively, "Gateway Region") and can also perform other regional responsibilities for water development and management, as described herein." Paragraph #2 of Agreement - "Purposes. This Agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, relating to the exercise of powers common to the Members. The purpose of this Agreement is to jointly exercise the powers set forth herein as to the Gateway Region, and, acting as a "regional water management group", to jointly prepare and/or adopt a "regional plan" for the management of water resources, and for implementation and operation of "qualified projects or programs", and/or the preparation of "qualified reports and studies", as those quoted terms are defined in the IRWMPA." Paragraph #3 of Agreement - "Establishment. Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Government Code Sections 6600, et. seq.), there is hereby established a Joint Powers Authority which shall be a regional water management group and a public entity separate from the parties to this Agreement. The name of such entity shall be the Los Angeles Gateway Region Integrated Regional Water Management Authority ("Authority"). The Authority shall carry out its functions through a Governing Board, as described in this Agreement." 3. Any city or agency within the Gateway region, regardless of membership is considered a Gateway region stakeholder for purposes of planning and implementation. All references to stakeholders within the Gateway region should be deleted. 4. Coordination with the Gateway COG is being done by the GWMA. Please delete any reference to the Gateway COG and refer them to the Gateway IRWM Plan. 5. The City of Long Beach, in support of the Gateway regional planning effort has submitted all of its potential projects in the GWMA IRWMP. Please delete any and all references to their projects, including the Graywater project. 6. The City of Lynwood is an active stakeholder participant as well as a GWMA member. Please delete references to projects with the City of Lynwood. 7. Disadvantaged community outreach and participation is being done in coordination with the Gateway COG and the cities. Please delete all references to disadvantaged community identification and outreach within the Gateway jurisdictional region. 8. The 8 projects submitted for the Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles sub-region reflect the non-local participation. By deleting the Long Beach Graywater Project, the remaining 7 project proponents are very large regional agencies with no local stakeholder participation. Please transfer those projects to the Gateway Region which does have significant local stakeholder participation. We appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments on the GLAC IRWM Plan Update. We look forward to coordinating our mutual efforts as adjacent, cooperating planning areas in Los Angeles County.	Please see response b1.
z1	6/28/2013	Grassroots Coalition/Sierra Club-Airport Marina Group	Grassroots Coalition and the Sierra Club- Airport Marina Group SUPPORT and AGREE with the comments made by Ms. Dillard. Though this response is apparently outside your "FORM" requirement, we request that you accept this correspondence as RESPONSE to IRWMP. The public has been shut out of the process as cited by Ms. Dillard and simultaneously are used by IRWMP as being included in excessive ways that are simply false.  Again, please include this as response to the IRWMP and know that if not included, this will simply be an extension of the exclusion that already exists.	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. Comments noted.
aa1	6/28/2013	Heal the Bay	We are concerned that the document assumes that the objectives and targets set within these existing plans are appropriate for our Region. In other words, these targets may be more of a "business-as-usual" scenario and not forward thinking to the actual needs of the Region and to what is actually possible. The document should incorporate goals into the Plan such as Vision 2021 developed by UCLA's Institute of the Environment.	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. The objectives and targets established in this Plan are representative of the actual planning efforts undertaken by the agencies within the GLAC Region. We are aware of the greater potential that may be available but to quantify this is beyond the scope of this Plan update.
aa2	6/28/2013	same as above	This goal should be eliminated. Desalination should only be considered when we maximize regional water conservation and recycling efforts. Desalination plants produce a concentrated salty brine that could create water quality problems in Santa Monica Bay. In addition, some proposed desalination plants are built at the same location as outdated power plants with old technology. This could result in impingement and entrainment of marine life. In addition, there are major energy consumption issues associated with this technology and conflicts with the climate change goals.	The objectives and targets established in this Plan are representative of the actual planning efforts undertaken by the agencies within the GLAC Region. To exclude desalination would provide a disservice for the GLAC Region and the Plan Update. Please note that individual project proponents are required to obtain permits and comply with CEQA, and therefore must comply with regulatory requirements to protect water quality.
aa3	6/28/2013	same as above	We concur that additional focus on local water supplies is necessary due to many stressors, including climate change. However, it is unclear how the additional percentage was developed. This should be based on modeling outputs that have been validated and calibrated. Perhaps Alex Hall's work from UCLA could inform this target.	The percentage of the local planning supplies was included based on an assessment of all of the 2010 Urban Water Management Plans within the GLAC Region. This is actual data provided by agencies who have the authority to implement local water supply projects.
aa4	6/28/2013	same as above	It is unclear how proposed projects will be evaluated and prioritized to ensure that they are, in fact, individually and collectively contributing to achieving the stated objectives and priorities. On a similar note, it is unclear how the proposed projects will be evaluated and prioritized to ensure they are meeting multiple benefits (i.e. water quality and water supply). Strong evaluation criteria are necessary to make these determinations and move forward a suite of projects that will do the most good (meet objectives and priorities) regionally.	Project evaluation criteria are not included in the Plan Update. This effort is undertaken at the subregional Steering Committee level. The evaluation of projects will be dependent on the funding source sought for the project, and the Steering Committees will be evaluating each project against available funding source parameters.

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses  
12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
ab1	6/28/2013	Joyce Dillard	The form provided for comment is preferable for an administrative draft review, but not in line with any public approach to comments. We question if the notice for this draft appeared in any newspaper read by the general population. Lacking in the process, is posting of meetings legally required as well as public entrance anonymity as per the Brown Act. The www.lawaterplan.org website is password protected for meeting notification. Again this is not legal notification to the public. We see no attempts to create a Conflict of Interest Code and file Forms 700 Statement of Economic Interest. We see no contact name for Public Record Requests.	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. The Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Act was established to encourage integrated regional strategies for management of water resources and to provide state funding for implementation projects that support integrated water management. As such, the GLAC IRWMP Region has no authority to make land use decisions, allocate water rights, or collect or spend tax dollars, and is not subject to the Brown Act. However, we recognize the issues with our public notification process for public comments and meetings and will continue to work to improve this process. The contact for any IRWMP-related issues is located on the homepage of www.lawaterplan.org. There is no legal requirement for IRWMP regions to file Forms 700 or create a Conflict of Interest Code; however, RWMP members comply with this requirement through their employers as necessary.
ab2	6/28/2013	same as above	Page No. XVI Section No. Preference Title Original Text A number of outcomes resulted from the 2013 Plan Update process. These efforts built upon the foundation developed and described in the 2006 Plan to accomplish the following: Improve outreach to DACs and other stakeholders Refine objectives and targets reflecting existing regional and subregional planning Increase subregional detail and focus Increase understanding of habitat, recreation and open space needs and opportunities Develop new tools to determine water quality and open space benefits and support integration Improve project database, user interface and review process Create a comprehensive assessment of potential climate change impacts, vulnerabilities and strategies Comment No where do you mention to outreach to the public and increase public awareness through education. Stakeholders used here is not about the public but about non-profit corporations. To whom are you designing the comprehensive assessment of potential climate change impacts, vulnerabilities and strategies-to water agencies, urban planners, Metropolitan Planning OrganizationsMPO?	The Disadvantaged Communities Outreach portion of Section 1 of the Plan describes outreach to the public and increased public awareness through education, and notes that this outreach is an ongoing process. Stakeholders include a range of interested parties, including, but not limited to, public agencies, non-profit organizations, private companies, and individuals. We welcome your feedback on ways to expand outreach and allow for more public inclusion into the process. The comprehensive assessment of potential climate change impacts, vulnerabilities and strategies was developed by the RWMP members (see section 1.4 Leadership Committee Sub-Committees for a description of participants).
ab3	6/28/2013	same as above	Page No. XVI Section No. Preface Title Preface Original Text As a result of these planning efforts, outside funding sources, such as the state and federal government, are more likely to support and fund this Plan because it demonstrates an (sic) intent to solve local problems, rather than simply look for others to solve those problems. As this planning process has included the creation of quantitative goals for measurable progress and accountability, it will lead to the identification of solutions and partnerships to implement these solutions. Comment This is not based in any concrete outreach. This is strictly an opinion that outside funding sources are more likely to support and fund this Plan. Quantitative goals are much different than measurable progress and accountability. What measurable progress and accountability exist. Where are the reports defining hard core data applied to the goals. Identification of solutions and partnerships to implement these solutions shows that this group does not have membership that covers the needs of the area. It is not integrated and cannot even identify solutions yet with the group formed. You have not covered even all the jurisdictional issues.	Text has been modified from the Original Text.
ab4	6/28/2013	same as above	Page No. XVII Section No. Preface Title Preface Original Text Water resources must be planned in concert with the other issues that make up the urban context. Therefore, the Plan's recommendations and strategies have been developed such that they can be integrated into the strategic planning for other important urban issues such as transportation, public education, land use, economic development, and health and safety. Because of the importance of these things to every community, there are many opportunities for win-win relationships that help create more functionally integrated communities and improve quality of life as the population of the Region continues to grow. Comment This is a wish list comment and delusional to any real watershed planning. Those who would use this information must be at the table. There is no legal requirement to include any recommendation or strategy into any other plan. The plan is not even reviewed in CEQA documentation for project planning at any level. There is no outreach and, again, the stakeholders are limited to those involved in this funding process, not in a planning process. We see no justification for a win-win relationships without outreach and inclusion.	Text has been modified from the Original Text. The GLAC Region welcomes feedback on ways to outreach and allow for more public inclusion into the process. This IRWMP is a feasibility or planning study which identifies possible future actions that the members of the RWMP have not approved, adopted, or funded. Consistent with Section 15262 of the CEQA Guidelines, a project involving only feasibility or planning studies does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration but does require consideration of environmental factors.
ab5	6/28/2013	same as above	Page No. XVII Section No. Preface Title Preface Original Text The Region's management strategies and projects developed within the IRWM context respond to statewide priorities, allow for local variation, while also providing a unified approach toward achieving multiple benefits across the Region. Comment The statewide priorities referred to are under the Department of Water Resources only. We see no unified approach in the regions because of the breakaway of Gateway Cities into the Los Angeles Gateway Area JPA. They are apart of the watershed whether they participate in this planning or do their own planning. Missing, again, is the outreach for inclusion in the proper forum. That does not mean unification. You first must want to talk at higher political levels that affect financing. Most elected officials we deal with have very little education in these issues and their interests remain in their particular jurisdiction. Without that informed discussion, there can be no negotiation or compromise. The officials with the final governmental decision, at this point in time, cannot address a watershed, water resources and ecosystem approach.	The IRWM Grant Program was developed by the Department of Water Resources, which has authority to develop the California Water Plan. The statewide priorities referred to in the GLAC IRWMP were developed through the California Water Plan process, and are required to be considered in developing an IRWMP. The members of the GLAC Region strive to educate their elected officials on the IRWMP process and the GLAC IRWM Plan. The GLAC Region Leadership Committee members and Steering Committee members recognize the importance of providing a unified approach toward achieving multiple benefits across the region. Our agencies are better working together than operating solely with our agencies' individual goals. The GLAC Plan Update acknowledges this and weaves this theme throughout the sections of the Plan Update.
ab6	6/28/2013	same as above	Page No. XVII Section No. Preface Title Preface Original Text This Plan is intended to be a tool for the development of solutions that achieve the planning targets identified for the Region and improve the sustainability of water resources and ecological health of local watersheds. The residents of the Region will benefit from the projects and opportunities identified in this Plan, as more sustainable water resources can improve the quality of life for all communities. New and enhanced partnerships have developed during the Plan update process and many more partnerships are expected to develop and grow. This Plan should be considered a living document. The vision, ideas and project concepts contained in this Plan will only become a reality if stakeholders remain engaged as this process continues. Comment How do you improve the quality of life for all communities when they do not even know that this group exists or that the Plan exists? They do not even have a way to find out about meetings. Only non-profit corporations who financially benefit would have an interest in this process. That does not mean communities are included or even considered. Urban Planning is part of the quality of life for all communities, but they are not at the table and these plans are not incorporated into the process. General Plans and Its Elements are required by State law. Watershed Management planning is not.	The agencies on the GLAC Leadership Committee and the subregional Steering Committees represent the best interests of the people who live and work within their jurisdictions. All of the entities on these committees represent either a public agency or a non-profit organization with the intent of providing the best services to the communities they serve.
ab7	6/28/2013	same as above	Page No. 1-2 Section No. 1.1 Background Title Governance and Participation-Background Original Text To ensure the delivery of clean and reliable water in this century, agencies and jurisdictions in the Region will benefit from a visionary plan that integrates water supply, water quality, flood management and open space strategies; and maximizes the utilization of local water resources. This Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP or Plan) reflects the Region's collaborative efforts to ensure a sustainable water supply through the more efficient use of water, the protection and improvement of water quality, and environmental stewardship Comment Open space strategies are not under this jurisdiction, unless that open space is unincorporated LA County. Open space planning aka Parks and Recreation is a land use planning function. Urban planners are not at the table. Water supply is under the jurisdiction of water suppliers. Not all water suppliers sit at the table. Environmental stewardship is important, but the jurisdictional participation does not exist for success execution.	Many open space agencies either participate or were consulted during development of the OSHARTM. However, we agree that more efforts will be needed in the future to integrate habitat, open space, park planning and urban planning with water resource planning. At a project level, urban planners are included through city and County representation in implementation of projects.

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses  
12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
ab8	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-4 Section No. 1.2 Title Context Original Text These strategies consist of water conservation and urban stormwater runoff management, wastewater quality improvements and expanded use of recycled water, maintenance of flood protection, and other environmental needs including habitat and open space conservation and the provision of sufficient park space. In a region facing significant urban challenges such as population growth, densification, traffic congestion, poor air quality, water resource management also must be integrated with other urban planning issues. This IRWMP suggests a proactive approach to addressing the Region's water resource needs, based on a vision established through extensive stakeholder input that is consistent with planning principles identified in regional planning documents such as the SCAG Compass Growth Vision Report (SCAG, 2004).</p> <p>Comment The strategies can only address the legal governance issues. Non-profit corporations do not have that legal governance and the agencies are under control of a Board or Council or other governance structure. The word proactive is over used. There is not a proactive approach. You do not even attempt to outreach to all Council of Governments whose focus is on population growth and transportation planning or attempt to bring them to the table simultaneously. SCAG Southern California Association of Governments does not sit at the table and they are a Metropolitan Planning Organization MPO under State law. All of this work is not applied in SCAG planning. We have questioned the lack of water and sewage planning at the SCAG planning outreach meetings. They were not interested in the discussion.</p>	<p>Several Council of Governments are represented in the GLAC Region including the South Bay COG and Westside COG in the South Bay and NSMB subregions, and the San Gabriel Valley COG in the USG/RH subregion. Subregional Steering Committees conduct periodic outreach to potential stakeholders within their sub-region. SCAG data is used as a resource in various sections of the IRWM Plan. Refer to response ab7.</p>
ab9	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-4 Section No. 1.2 Title Context Original Text With the cost of compliance with surface water quality regulations estimated to range from \$43 to \$284 billion (Brown and Caldwell, 1989 and Gordon, et al, 2002), jurisdictions and agencies in the Region face difficult funding choices. The integration of multiple water management strategies via multipurpose projects creates opportunities to meet regional water resource needs, efficiently use fiscal resources, and provide the public with tangible community benefits.</p> <p>Comment The cost of compliance should be addressed in a finer approach. It is not even realistic by any means and lacks intensive discussion. With the attempt by the LA County Flood Control District and the Department of Public Works to place a Clean Water, Clean Beaches Measure on the ballot to suffice demands of the NPDES MS4 permit, the public and other governmental agencies were in uproar over the cost, reduction of cash flow and no sunset. What is the definition of multipurpose projects? Most recreational planning has no water aspect addressed. Pesticides usage is not even limited. We do not see the Total Daily Maximum Load application to any project outside the purview of this group and the agencies governing local compliance. We do not see the justification of tangible community benefits at this point in time.</p>	<p>Each project that is implemented through the IRWM program benefits the communities in some way. The intent of the IRWM program and the funding received for projects within the GLAC Region through the IRWM Program is to enhance the communities through better water resources management which encompasses a variety of projects.</p>
ab10	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-5 Section No. 1-4 Title IRWMP Process Original Text The Leadership Committee also includes 5 ex-officio (non-voting members), including: California State, Coastal Conservancy, United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service: Angeles National Forest, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE): Los Angeles District.</p> <p>Comment The ex-officio members may be listed, but not at the table. They may be invited, but their attendance is questionable. Missing is the Department of Conservation-Office of Oil, Gas and Geothermal DOGR participation when their oversight includes not only major water usage but hydraulic fracturing or fracking and waste water injection. This affects not only this region, but regions that may be important to water conveyance stability such as the Bay-Delta and LADWP Aqueduct Pipeline.</p>	<p>Several of the ex-officio members of the GLAC Region may and do participate in various ways: via the Leadership Committee, subregional Steering Committees, project submittals and/or reviewing documents and providing input. It is recognized that participation could always be improved.</p>
ab11	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-5 Section No. 1-4 Title IRWMP Process Original Text The Leadership Committee holds monthly publically noticed meetings to provide overall program guidance, address regional issues and provide collaboration and coordination between the Subregions. LC meeting agendas and minutes are posted on the GLACs IRWM website www.lawaterplan.org and are made available to those without computer access by contacting LACFCD staff</p> <p>Comment These meetings are not publically noticed. This is total deception. Posting on a website is not the legal requirements of the Brown Act or the Bagley-Keene Act and is password protected. Leadership Committee meetings require identification to enter the building, which is a violation of the open meeting acts. The public is not encouraged. There is no outreach for inclusion of the public. Website posting is not in Spanish or any of the 100 plus languages in the County for DAC outreach purposes.</p>	<p>Meetings held at the LA County Department of Public Works' headquarters building in Alhambra requires non-employees to provide identification. This is a security issue and not unusual for a public building. This is in no way meant to exclude the public from participating in the meetings. If there is a request for information to be posted in another language, then we will address the issue at that time. No requests have been made to date to provide information in a language other than English. The GLAC IRWMP is not subject to the Brown Act or the Bagley-Keene Act requirements. As previously stated, efforts to improve the website and public notification process will be made in the future. Currently, access to the calendar is through the project database and requires registration to ensure the integrity of the project database.</p>
ab12	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-10 Section No. 1-4 Title IRWMP Process Original Text The SCs meet monthly, or as-needed, within the Subregion to provide opportunities for direct input into the IRWMP process by stakeholders. The format and agendas of SC meetings are flexible to allow for collaboration and input on a variety of IRWM related topics and activities. Examples include workshops to discuss Plan Update topics and comment on drafts materials; presentation sessions for project proponents in advance of grant applications or to facilitate integration; formal voting sessions on governance; and information sharing on related regional planning efforts, funding opportunities, meetings and activities.</p> <p>Comment Stakeholders mean the project proponents and sitting agencies. Non-profit corporations participate as project proponents and may also sit as Steering Committee members. Public stakeholder participation is not encouraged or addressed in any formal outreach process. Steering Committees are a productive environment in include DAC participation, if held in a meeting room available without requirements of entrance by personal identification. The meetings posted on the website are password protected and require registration to access.</p>	<p>See previous responses.</p>
ab13	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-10 to 1-11 Section No. 1-4 Title IRWMP Process Original Text Membership is largely dependent upon the ability and interest of an entity to regularly participate in SC meetings. Regular participation by a consistent voting body is desired to ensure that an educated voting quorum is in attendance at each meeting. Although the SC membership are the only stakeholders that can vote on motions, any stakeholder attending SC meetings is able to participate in all other agenda items and discussions at the same level as Committee members.</p> <p>Comment The aspect of round table discussion does occur, at least, at the Upper LA River Steering Committee. As a public participant, we are able to discuss items and not just observe and are appreciative of that openness. We question if the conference call meetings at other Steering Committees allow for that open discussion.</p>	<p>All subregional Steering Committees are open to the public and allow for public engagement whether in person or on the phone.</p>
ab14	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-11 Section No. 1-5 Title Stakeholder Involvement Original Text The majority of stakeholder input to the IRWMP is conducted at the Subregional level which is then reported to the LC through the Subregional representatives during a standing LC meeting agenda items called "Subregional Reports." Since Subregional SC meetings are held locally, they increase the ability and time allowed for individual stakeholder participation. All GLAC stakeholders and general public are also invited to attend the monthly LC meetings and can speak during the public comment period.</p> <p>Comment Leadership Committee meetings are not easily to attend as Identification is required to enter the LA County Public Works building in Alhambra. This is in violation of the Brown Act. The public should be able to enter and exit freely and anonymously. There are no legal postings in three physical locations. The website is password protected requiring the public to register with a user name to view a meeting posted. There is an email distribution list, but the public needs to be aware of it in order to be notified of a meeting via email. The emails are distributed in English. The public should be allowed to speak to any agenda item, not just Public Comment. Again, this is in violation of the Brown Act. Outreach to the public has been almost non-existent. Press releases have never been used as a distribution method to organized groups such as the City of Los Angeles Neighborhood Councils or homeowners groups. Los Angeles Neighborhood Councils now group themselves in regional groups which could aid in notification and distribution of meeting materials. The Leadership Committee or the Steering Committees have not outreached to any of these regional neighborhood council collaboratives, to our knowledge, nor asked for a committee to be formed around the issue.</p>	<p>While the IRWM meetings are not required to comply with the Brown Act or the Bagley Keene Act, the GLAC Region nevertheless strives for an open and transparent process by posting meeting agendas and other pertinent information on lawaterplan.org. The GLAC Region recognizes the issues associated with requiring registration to obtain a login and password to view the calendar, and anticipates amending that process in the future to allow unencumbered access to the meeting notices. Any meetings held at the LA County Department of Public Works' headquarters building in Alhambra, require non-employees to provide identification for security purposes, as became common practice among most public buildings post September 11, 2001. The identification information is in no way related to or collected by the GLAC IRWMP.</p>

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses  
12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
ab15	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-11 Section No. 1-5 Title Stakeholder Involvement Original Text Various stakeholder groups (e.g., the Ballona Creek Watershed Task Force and regional Councils of Government (COGs)) forward IRWMP messages to their constituencies, thereby extending the reach to additional stakeholders. Initially, written communications in the form of letters to cities and press releases to the media were utilized to expand awareness of, and participation in, the IRWMP. Comment We do not see the involvement of Councils of Government in all regions available such as the San Fernando Valley COG. Not all regions are covered by participation in Council of Governments. Notifications should be distributed to municipalities to post on their websites.</p>	Please see response ab8.
ab16	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-16 Section No. 1-5 Title Stakeholder Involvement Original Text The newly developed GLAC IRWM project database has a web access user interface that is linked to the GLAC Website as a means to provide more a more dynamic and interactive interface for posting current and temporal information regarding upcoming meetings, announcements and is the main tool used for documenting and viewing both conceptual and IRWM projects and information. Figure 1-6 shows the project database user interface. The project database is accessible at all times to anyone that registers with a name and password as a user. The project database has a straightforward and easy web-based user interface and allows users to: View LC and SC meeting agendas and minutes See recent announcements including links to documents available for review Upload and modify project information for review by SCS View maps with locations of current conceptual and approved IRWM projects View conceptual and approved IRWM Project lists and details Comment Any registration on a website is not open to the public. Again, this shows how that Integrated Regional Water Management planning is not even designed to be incorporating in those plans required by law by other agencies. If they cannot easily access the information, why should they use it?</p>	See previous responses.
ab17	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-17 Section No. 1-5 Title Stakeholder Involvement Original Text The DAC Outreach Evaluation Program is currently being implemented by the Council for Watershed Health in the following communities: Northeast Gardena/North Harbor Gateway Northern North Hollywood Portions of El Monte and South El Monte Eastside neighborhood of Central Long Beach Maywood Comment This is a small outreach to an area that is amassed in poverty. There are 32 contiguous census tracts in the City of Los Angeles alone, that are a main source of poverty funding. Because of poverty, taxpayer funding pours into these areas making the public subjective to repression. Money has more voice than a person. This makes outreach difficult in DAC areas. Trust is key and finding those inroads through established groups, churches and individuals will result in DAC outreach. Political and elected official connections are suspect in DAC areas. DAC areas have immigrant populations whose water knowledge extends to farming, fishing and rural occupations. Their experience is vital. Grandfathered projects, pollution and land use need to be identified in any DAC issue. Materials need to be distributed in English and the language used such as Spanish or any of the Asian languages. Meetings should be held at the culturally effective time. Some cultures prefer morning meetings. Some cultures prefer late afternoon-early evening meetings.</p>	The DAC Outreach Evaluation Program evaluated the best way to conduct outreach to DACs which will guide future outreach to the broader DAC communities on water resource-related activities. The final outreach report will be posted in December 2013 on the GLAC website.
ab18	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-19 Section No. 1-5 Title Stakeholder Involvement Original Text The GLAC Region contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to determine if the Region was home to any tribes or tribal interests. The response from the NAHC indicated that the Region is not home to any current tribes or tribal lands but provided the contact name and information of several individuals listed as having tribal interests that reside within the GLAC Region. A letter was sent by the LC to each of the individuals on the listing to explain the IRWM Plan Update process, provide contact and Website information and encourage participation. Comment There are Indian tribal interests in the area active in Watershed issues. Burial issues are important though no tribes are recognized federally. Tribal interests should be recognized, by tribal name, in this plan.</p>	A letter was sent by the LC to each of the individuals listed on the Native American Heritage Commission listing.
ab19	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-19 Section No. 1-5 Title Stakeholder Involvement Original Text Many of the water agencies, and most of the cities in the Region have participated either directly, or through the participation of a Council of Governments (COG) representative. Four COGs (Gateway Cities, Westside Cities, San Gabriel Valley Cities, South Bay Cities) have been active in the IRWMP process. Through the stakeholder workshops, the water agencies, cities, COGs and municipal agencies have advocated for their respective local planning needs and issues, which have been incorporated into the IRWMP. COGs and municipal agencies have advocated for their respective local planning needs and issues, which have been incorporated into the IRWMP. Subsequently, the outcomes from the IRWMP planning process have been disseminated by the representatives back to their local governments and planning agencies, allowing the IRWMP priorities and plans to be considered in local planning where appropriate. In addition, water agencies can factor IRWMP programs and priorities into their individual plans. As future updates of the IRWMP occur, local entities that use that update to further refine or adapt these local plans. Comment Gateway Cities is participates in their own Los Angeles Gateway Area JPA. Not included is the San Fernando Valley COG, so outreach is not thorough. City of Los Angeles is critical and not all areas of the city are covered under COGs. Planning needs are not addressed in relationship to watershed issues in the City of Los Angeles planning process. We see no incorporation, unless by smaller cities.</p>	Please see response ab8.
ab20	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-20 Section No. 1-5 Title Stakeholder Involvement Original Text Given the physical connection between the Gateway and the GLAC regions, DWR maintains that in order to effectively plan and address regional concerns, such as storm water management, wastewater treatment and recycling, and aging infrastructure, cooperation between the GLAC and Gateway regions is imperative. Comment The political divide is huge between the two planning areas. This group does not approach those difficult political aspects of the dominance of the City of Los Angeles in Sacramento and Federal influence over funding. IRWM planning is not incorporated into the plans and reports generated over City of Los Angeles projects. Why would Gateway Cities want to be an underdog when they have cities that cooperate on many municipal aspects long before the formation of the IRWMP?</p>	Comment noted.
ab21	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-23 Section No. 1-7 Title 2013 Plan Update Process Original Text For this Plan Update effort, the OSHARP represents the outcome of a significant exchange of knowledge and expertise between land use and water resource managers. And while agreement on regional open space and habitat targets were developed through this process, the sensitive local land use issues precluded agreement on subregional targets. It is understood that the IRWMP process is on-going and therefore there are opportunities to build upon these efforts. More dialogue between municipal land use planners, councils of governments and resource planners will be needed in the refinement of targets and objectives at the local level in the next Plan Update. Comment There is no legal requirement to include this Plan in the Land Use Planning process of the General Plan process. There is not the awareness of water resource planning because of the extensive detail and jurisdictional issues in water resource delivery. Ecosystems are not even discussed in Land Use Planning, but Flood Planning is. This group needs to outreach, at least, in those areas that municipalities are legally required to file.</p>	We hope that the GLAC IRWMP will help build understanding of the interconnections between land use and water resource planning. See previous responses.

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses  
12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
ab22	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 1-25 Section No. 1-10 Title Plan Update Outcomes Original Text Table 1-3 Technical Analysis Population Projections Projected population increase using SCAG population projected increases for Los Angeles County. Comment SCAG population projects are required for transportation planning, but their accuracy is questionable.</p>	SCAG population data is the tool that is used when Census data is not available.
ab23	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 2-2 to 2-3 Section No. 2-2 Title REGIONAL DESCRIPTION Overview Original Text These coastal watersheds share many of the same water resource management issues, including substantial dependence on imported water, significant opportunities to further expand water conservation, and substantial utilization of recycled water. Water resource management planning at this scale provides an opportunity to optimize use of local water resources including stormwater runoff, recycled water, and groundwater to reduce dependence on imported water and concurrently enhance water supply reliability. Thus, the selection of a regional boundary based on coastal watershed boundaries facilitates the development of an integrated water supply portfolio that relies on multipurpose projects and programs to address similar water management issues. With so many agencies and jurisdictions responsible for water management in the GLAC Region, the development of an IRWM Plan has not resolved or eliminated every potential conflict in a region of more than 2,000 square miles. However, the development of the IRWM Plan, ongoing meetings to discuss common issues and concerns, identification and integration of multi-purpose projects, and collaborative efforts to increase opportunities to fund those projects, has greatly enhanced the willingness of these entities to seek mutually beneficial solutions to problems that historically were a source of conflict. Comment Stormwater is regulated by permit with few to no regulations for Public Health and Safety. Stormwater Capture is being used as a water source except the regulations for groundwater recharge has not caught up with these major Capital Projects of underground storage tanks. Parks are being used as a multipurpose project without consideration of migratory bird patterns or any cognitive recognition of viruses. Contamination and increased bacteria remains a major concern for stormwater capture. The region was designed for imported water for population and development growth. Those systems are still legally relied on. There have not been any attempts to address or change, legally, those groundwater rights and allocations. Development of water supply in this region needs weather analysis as well as seasonal analysis. Storage above ground or dams has not been addressed in this plan. There is no new defined approach until adopted by a governing body or determined by the courts.</p>	Comment noted.
ab24	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 2-4 Section No. 2-2 Title Overview Original Text Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo Sub region (Title) Comment Rio Hondo is part of the LA River, not the San Gabriel River. This placement is political.</p>	The Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo subregion was created based on the first planning grant process in 2005.
ab25	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 2-27 Section No. 2-5 Title Sources of Water Supply and Infrastructure Original Text Groundwater represents a significant portion of local supplies in the Region, approximately 35 percent of the Region's entire supply in 2010. Most groundwater basins in the Region are adjudicated (via a court decision) and producers within these basins follow management guidelines established by their respective adjudications. Exceptions are the Orange County Basin, Santa Monica Basin, Hollywood Basin, and Puente Basin. The City of Santa Monica has implemented a groundwater management plan for the Santa Monica Basin. The Orange County Basin (which extends outside the southern boundary of the Region) is managed by Orange County Water District, which was established in 1933. Groundwater basin recharge can occur via existing and restored natural channel bottoms or percolation of rainwater (natural recharge), however natural recharge is typically insufficient to maintain basin water levels and current pumping levels due to the extent of impervious surfaces and the presence of clay soils in parts of the Region. Many agencies rely on artificial recharge, by diverting local supplies from rivers or creeks when flow conditions are optimal, to spreading grounds (or basins) which typically contain sandy soils that promote infiltration. In some locations, spreading is limited because of the capacity limitations of the spreading facilities rather than being limited by water supply. Historical concerns about the presence of urban contaminants in stormwater may also limit the amount of local water that can be recharged, although the Water Augmentation Study conducted by the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council monitored several sites and determined that stormwater pollutants do not degrade groundwater quality. In addition, recycled water is infiltrated in spreading grounds and injected (along with imported water) along the coast to form barriers to seawater intrusion at three locations (the Alamitos, Dominguez Gap, and West Coast Basin Barriers). This water augments and blends with groundwater, which is eventually extracted for potable use. Comment Groundwater basins that are not adjudicated have individual property owner rights. Not taken into consideration either in discussion or mapping is the Oil Resources of the region and the Monterey Shale that is important in fracking extraction of oil and natural gas. We are in DOGR District 1 and have attached the Oil and Gas Wells Map-2013, Oil, Gas, and Water Production from Oil Fields-2012 District 1; Gas, Condensate, and Water Production from Gas Fields and Zones-2012 District 1; and Producing Wells and Production of Oil, Gas, and Water By County-2011. Also attached are the USC Report: Hydraulic Fracturing and Shale Reservoirs in California with extracted maps: Monterey Formation in California; Occurrence of Monterey and Related Siliceous Rocks; and San Pedro Basin-Santa Ana Mountains. Also attached is the USC Report: Induced Seismicity Aspects of Hydraulic Fracturing with mention of testing in San Joaquin Valley. In non-adjudicated groundwater basins, oil right royalties are paid to many property owners. Groundwater infiltration needs soils and geology analysis, of which we do not believe, is addressed. Former agricultural land uses are the groundwater areas used for infiltration. Only those few areas should be in discussion, not the whole region.</p>	The requested analysis is beyond the scope of the IRWMP.
ab26	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 2-28 Section No. 2-5 Title Sources of Water Supply and Infrastructure Original Text The MWD contract with the DWR, operator of the SWP, is for 1,911,500 AFY. However, MWD projects a minimum dry year supply from the SWP of 370,000 AFY, and average annual deliveries of 1.4 million acre-feet/ year. These amounts do not include water which may become available from transfer and storage programs, or Delta improvements. Comment This group has not addressed some of the water reliability or unreliability issues of the SWP and the Delta. Because of the Monterey Shale, oil and natural gas fracking is an economic driver in the San Joaquin Valley. Aspects of wastewater injection and seismicity have not even been addressed. With earthquakes, comes disruption. This has not been in this planning process.</p>	The requested analysis related to hydraulic fracturing is beyond the scope of the IRWMP.
ab27	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 2-29 Section No. 2-5 Title Sources of Water Supply and Infrastructure Original Text Los Angeles Aqueducts As a result of these restrictions on water transfers, future deliveries are expected to be reduced to an average of 254,000 AFY over the next 20 years. Comment Because of fracking for oil and natural gas in Kern County, the possibility of seismicity increases and water reliability has not been addressed due to earthquake activity and disruption of service.</p>	Comment noted.
ab28	6/28/2013	same as above	<p>Page No. 4-6 to 4-7 Section No. 4-3 Title 2013 GLAC Region Water Management Strategies Original Text Opportunities for the optimized use of groundwater basins in the Region include: a reduction in impervious surfaces to increase native infiltration; expansion of existing, or construction of new, conjunctive use facilities to spread or inject both local and imported water when available; expansion of existing, or development of new, projects to replenish local groundwater aquifers using recycled water; enhancement of seawater intrusion barrier facilities to increase their effectiveness; implementation of projects to recharge treated stormwater; and inter-basin transfers of recycled water. All of these opportunities for optimized use of groundwater basins should be used to maximize storage potential identified in Table 4-2; to the extent that institutional challenges can be overcome and cost-effectiveness can be demonstrated. Comment This report does not address Soil and Geology analysis for infiltration. Low Impact Development ordinances are a method used that may not necessarily improve water quality or stormwater runoff reduction.</p>	The requested analysis is beyond the scope of the IRWMP.

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses

12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
ab29	6/28/2013	same as above	Page No. 4-8 Section No. 4-3 Title 2013 GLAC Region Water Management Strategies Original Text The protection of surface water quality (e.g., in the rivers, creeks, and storm drains) is regulated by the SWRCB and its RWQCBs, via the applicable Basin Plan, which identifies surface and groundwater bodies, designates applicable beneficial use classifications to each water body, establishes general and water body-specific water quality objectives; and suggests an implementation plan for maintaining or restoring the water quality objectives. The RWQCBs utilize NPDES permits and Waste Discharge Requirements to limit the discharge of contaminants and protect surface water quality. Comment Requirements of the current NPDES for most of the plan area are not addressed here, but weigh in on formation of Watershed Management Areas or Enhance Watershed Management Areas. This is another component of layering planning without legal jurisdiction matching with funding. Controversial, attempts to place a Clean Water, Clean Beaches Measure for a Parcel Tax to fund this process as a result of the MS4 permitting process has occurred. Controversial issues are not addressed in this plan.	See response a4.
ab30	6/28/2013	same as above	Page No. 4-23 Section No. 4-3 Title 2013 GLAC Region Water Management Strategies Original Text Opportunities for enhancement and creation of the Region's wetlands include: Los Cerritos Wetland Restoration (Bryant, Bixby, and Hellman); Gardena Willows Restoration; Ballona Wetlands Restoration; Colorado Lagoon Enhancement; DeForest-Dominguez Wetlands Restoration; Hansen Dam Recreational Area Wetlands Restoration Project; Los Angeles River Headworks Wetlands and Water Protection Project; the Multiuse Wetlands Project at Children's Museum of Los Angeles; and El Dorado Park Wetlands. Comment Controversial is the Ballona Wetlands Restoration. Not addressed publically in the governance forum legally over the property is the Multiuse Wetlands Project at Children's Museum of Los Angeles. This project is now known as the Discovery Science Center. This project has received federal funding including tax credits and there was no mention of a wetlands project. Attached is an extraction from Malibu Surfside News on the Malibu Massacre of the Malibu Lagoon. The public was misled and are angry. Controversy requires more than an IRWM Plan opportunity.	Comment noted.
ab31	6/28/2013	same as above	Page No. 4-24 Section No. 4-3 Title 2013 GLAC Region Water Management Strategies Original Text Current plans and proposals for new parks, trails and recreational projects in the Region include: Rio de Los Angeles State Park, Annandale Golf Course Habitat Restoration and Infiltration; Welch Site BMP and Habitat Restoration; Lincoln Heights Freeway Interchange Restoration and BMP; Malibu Linear and Civic Center Legacy Park; Trancas Canyon Park; Las Flores Creek Park; Morris Dam Peninsula Park; Azusa Canyon River Wilderness Park; San Gabriel River Master Plan, (National Park Service) San Gabriel River Watershed Special Resource Study, San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds; Maywood Riverfront Park; San Gabriel River Discovery Center at Whittier Narrows Regional Park; Woodland (Duck) Farm Park; Pio Pico State Historic Park; Paseo del Rio at San Gabriel and Rio Hondo Spreading Grounds; Santa Fe Springs Park Expansion; Downey Landing, City of Downey; Bellflower Riverfront Park; Pacoima Wash Greenway Project Parkside Drive Park; South Los Angeles Wetlands Park; Puente Creek Nature Center; Strathern Pit Multiuse Project; North Atwater Creek Restoration and Water Quality Enhancement; Marsh Street Park; Walteria Lake Enhancement; and Lafayette Creek Daylighting Comment Built is Rio de Los Angeles State Park and South Los Angeles Wetlands Park. Not even discussed in the community surrounding this project is Lincoln Heights Freeway Interchange Restoration and BMP.	Comment noted.
ac1	NA	Las Virgenes Municipal Water District	Various edits within sections of Plan. Provided as part of Plan Update Committee meetings.	NA
ad1	5/24/2013	Lauma Jurkevics	Pg. 2-66: Per 2012 Guidelines, p. 23: The IRWM Plan must include...a process that considers GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives.	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. Edits Incorporated and Comments Noted
ad2	5/24/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-67 - 2-68: Are these studies included in a "plan, program, or methodology for further data gathering and analysis of the prioritized vulnerabilities?" (see 2012 Guidelines, p. 23) Make that link within the paragraphs.	Edit Incorporated to reference Chapter 5, section 5.2, Procedures for Review of Projects to Implement the IRWM Plan.
ad3	5/24/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-68: I just don't see the link with Table 2-8. The sentence seems to suggest another type of expectation. Table 2-8 is really a result of analyzing vulnerabilities for the region, which is best left for the discussion that starts on p. 2-70.	Edits Incorporated
ad4	5/24/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-68: Also look at a more recent document, such as the 2011 Reliability Report for SWP for further information on supply.	This comment can be considered for further review in a subsequent plan update.
ad5	5/24/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-70: Seemed a little confusing with the term "revised" so I dropped it. The reader will still understand what you are conveying.	Comment Noted
ad6	5/24/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-70: Appears to be missing a word.	Edits Incorporated
ad7	5/24/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-70 - 2-71: Match up with the wording you have for Table 2-8.	Edits Incorporated
ad8	5/24/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-70: They seem to conflict with each other, once saying difficult to meet goal of 20%, then the other saying reducing options to go beyond 20%. There seems to be a disconnect between the concepts of those two sentences, so I proposed a connector phrase.	Edits Incorporated
ad9	5/24/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-70: Needs a wrap-up sentence to somehow indicate that increased rates could backfire. So I suggested the sentence in the earlier box.	Edits Incorporated
ad10	5/24/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-71: Need to connect the drought back to water demand.	Edits Incorporated
ad11	5/24/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-71: Vulnerability is coastal groundwater, per Table 2-8. One of the issues is keeping salinity out of that groundwater table, which is currently being done through barrier intrusion projects. I recall we had that discussion in the CC workgroup.	Edits Incorporated
ad12	5/24/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-72: Not sure why there's Registry in parentheses. The next sentence still spells it out. Best to keep as Climate Registry without shortening it.	Edits Incorporated
ae1	6/27/2013	Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts	Page 1-21 Add a bullet for "Open Space, Habitat, and Recreation (Appendix H) to the list of Technical Memorandums.	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. Edits Incorporated.
ae2	6/27/2013	same as above	Chapter 3 Edit the title of the water quality objective to read "Improve Surface Water Quality" in all relevant tables/discussions throughout the IRWMP (in some instances the objective reads "Improve Water Quality").  For starters, a list of tables is provided below, although it may not be complete: Table 3-1 Table 7-2 Table 11 in ULA Subregional Plan Table 6 in NSMB Subregional Plan Table 10 in USG/RH Subregional Plan Table 10 in SB Subregional Plan Table 8 in LLA/SG Subregional Plan ... and possibly other locations?	Edits Incorporated
ae3	6/27/2013	same as above	A gap is created by omitting all other water quality goals except stormwater quality. Please edit the objective to be consistent with the 2006 adopted IRWMP in all relevant tables/discussions throughout the updated IRWMP, to read: "Comply with water quality regulations (including TMDLs) by improving the quality of urban runoff, stormwater, and wastewater." For starters, a list of tables is provided below, although it may not be complete: Table 3-1 Table 7-2 Table 11 in ULA Subregional Plan Table 6 in NSMB Subregional Plan Table 10 in USG/RH Subregional Plan Table 10 in SB Subregional Plan Table 8 in LLA/SG Subregional Plan ... and possibly other locations?	Edits Incorporated
ae4	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 3-3 Insert "insufficient and/or seasonal" in the first sentence in the fourth paragraph under the heading "Improve Water Supply" before "demand and infrastructure limitations..."	Edits Incorporated
ae5	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 4-19 under the Habitat heading: Delete then ending of the first sentence so it reads: "As part of the 2013 Plan Update, the GLAC Region completed a Habitat, Open Space, and Recreation Technical Memorandum."	Edits Incorporated
ae6	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 4-20 Delete the sentence that reads: "The fundamental goal of ecosystem restoration is to return the selected ecosystem to a condition that resembles its natural pre disturbance state as closely as possible." This sentence conflicts with the DWR CWP Update sentence above.	Edits Incorporated
ae7	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 4-20 Delete "flood control," from the sentence that begins "The benefits of ecosystem restoration are difficult to quantify, but..."	Edits Incorporated
ae8	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 4-21 Delete "wastewater and" from the last sentence in the fourth paragraph above the heading "Environmental and Habitat Protection and Improvement (RMS # 22, 27).	Edits Incorporated
ae9	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 5-1, footnote below photograph. There are 135 projects in the IRWMP, not 1,500 (that number was a carryover from the 2006 IRWMP).	Edits Incorporated
ae10	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 5-1, first bullet point, and Page 5-4, and throughout the IRWMP: The Leadership Committee decided not to prioritize projects for the IRWMP. Therefore, all references to doing a prioritization need to be deleted.	Edits Incorporated

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses

12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
ae11	6/27/2013	same as above	Chapter 7 The Plan Performance section of the IRWMP assigns responsibilities to the Leadership Committee, and/or Subregional Steering Committees that should more appropriately remain responsibilities of the project proponents. These instances should be considered by the Plan Update Committee, and revised as deemed appropriate (for example, see page 7-3 re: correlating project benefit data to the Plan; page 7-11 re: if projects aren't performing as expected, alternate projects being "designated" (needs clarification that this is the right/responsibility of project proponents, not the LC or SCS).	Edits Incorporated
ae12	6/27/2013	same as above	Delete "OPTI" and replace with a generic phrase for a project database.	Edits Incorporated
ae13	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 7-3 under the heading "Periodic Plan Update Process". Add text to the last sentence in the first paragraph to read: "The project monitoring plans developed by the project proponents during the grant process must include the following information:"	Edits Incorporated
ae14	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 7-1 and 7-2: Delete the sentence and first 3 bullet points under the section heading "Plan Performance and Monitoring Standard".	Edits Incorporated
ae15	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 7-3, last sentence. Delete "that have received funding through the Region's implementation grant awards.". The reason for the edit is that all project proponents are invited to supply this information, but no project proponents are required to submit it, except those bound by DWR grant agreement provisions (or whatever funding source is obtained for each project).	Edits Incorporated
ae16	6/27/2013	same as above	Sections 7.4 and 7.5 The sense of these sections needs to be edited by the Plan Update Committee to remove what seems to be an underlying assumption that the direction the Leadership Committee took (in deciding to collect data from grant funded projects) is inadequate. Instead, there needs to be a more well developed description of the reasoning behind the decision: that there is a significant amount of required data that is already being collected through the various member agencies' respective reporting processes. In a region of this size and complexity, there is no need to start from scratch.	Edits Incorporated
ae17	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 7-4: under the heading "GLAC Data Management Approach". Revise the end of the first sentence "... implementing a Region-wide comprehensive data collection process into a single DMS, let alone one that is compatible with DWR requirements, would be prohibitively expensive without a commensurate benefit to stakeholders."	Edits Incorporated
ae18	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 7-5: Edit the sentence in the paragraph above the section heading "Current Monitoring Efforts": "Therefore, if Regional stakeholders and agencies wish to provide a link to their datasets from within the GLAC IRWMP database [or on lawwaterplan.org?], these datasets could be accessed by stakeholders, but the Region would not be responsible for determining if these datasets meet DWR requirements nor for including the data into the Plan Performance assessment process. [Delete the sentence after that, re: the Region possibly pursuing additional funding to enhance the DMS.]	Edits Incorporated
ae19	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 7-7 Under the "Plan's Key Parameters of Concern" Edit the second sentence to read "Since individual project monitoring plans may not exactly correlate to the language used in the targets below, the Subregional SCS will seek information from project proponents be responsible for ensuring to ensure that the data is translated..."	Edits Incorporated
ae20	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 7-12 under heading "Plan Level" These sentences needs careful consideration/revision by the Plan Update Committee: "If both project and plan level responses do not lead to satisfactory results, then a change in institutional structure may be appropriate. This could involve identifying and bringing on board missing players whose participation would improve success."	Edits Incorporated
ae21	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 7-13 under the "Enhanced Data Management and Plan Performance" heading (which needs a font/color change to be consistent) Add this to the end of the first sentence: " or those project proponents willing to submit data in the format acceptable to DWR/state databases." Revise the third sentence to read: "The volume of data from all projects implemented in the Region hinders the ability of the Region to include all those projects in the assessment of how the Region has performed in meeting the Plan's objectives." Suggest the Plan Update Committee delete and/or revise the last three sentences in this paragraph.	Edits Incorporated
ae22	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 7-14: Revise the sentence above the heading "Funding Sources and Methods" " Since future IRWM Program requirements are unknown, the depth and breadth of subsequent Plan updates can't be known at this time."	Edits Incorporated
ae23	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 7-14: Revise the last sentence at the end of the paragraph under the heading " Funding Sources and Methods.	Edits Incorporated
ae24	6/27/2013	same as above	Page 7-14: Revise this sentence in the second paragraph under the "Local Financing Strategy" heading: While existing funding mechanisms are in place for development of water supply and wastewater facilities and operation and maintenance of these facilities, these revenue sources are subject to voter approval or the Proposition 218 process and are therefore not guaranteed sources into the future. Grant revenue is therefore an important source of revenue.	Edits Incorporated
ae25	6/27/2013	same as above	OSHARP Section & Appendix  1. Overall: Although we appreciate the changes made earlier this year to address concerns with the draft OSHARP, we are still concerned that the document contained in the OSHARP Appendix goes well beyond the original intent that was approved by the Leadership Committee and described in the grant application. The key changes we request to align the document with that intent are as follows: a. Change the title from "Plan" to "Technical Memorandum (TM)." For other topics, such as water resources and water quality, TMs were developed, not Plans. The IRWMP itself is a Plan, and each separate topic should not, and does not, have its own separate standalone Plan. Furthermore, achievement of the goals set forth in the OSHARP is a task well beyond the scope of what most Regional Water Management Group members have the authority to achieve (for example, purchase/protection of significant acreages of parks and open space). b. Although we appreciate the attempt to address concerns about the application of the term "wetlands", because of potential regulatory implications, we are concerned about the implications of replacing the term "wetland" with "aquatic habitat". This issue requires further discussion and vetting by the Plan Update Committee to resolve it properly. Once resolved, the agreed-upon resolution must be reflected throughout all of the documents.	Edits Incorporated
ae26	6/27/2013	same as above	2. Chapter 4 of IRWMP, pp. 4-19 – 4-24: We request several changes to this section, consistent with our comments elsewhere in this comment summary. a. p. 4-19 – end the first sentence after the word OSHARP, and delete the remainder of the sentence. b. P. 4-20, right column – deleted the sentence that reads "The fundamental goal of ecosystem restoration is to return the selected ecosystem to a condition that resembles its natural pre-disturbance state as closely as possible." This is not a realistic goal, and contradicts text elsewhere on that page that acknowledges that few, if any, of California's ecosystems can be fully restored to the pre-disturbance condition. In the following paragraph, delete the words "flood control" because they are redundant with "flood protection" earlier in the same sentence. c. P. 4-21, left column – sentence ending at top, delete the words "wastewater and" because we are unaware of benefits related to wastewater treatment from ecosystem restoration.	Edits Incorporated
ae27	6/27/2013	same as above	3. Executive Summary: a. The goal and objective are described on pp. 1-2 of the Executive Summary as providing direction for "providing a comprehensive regional framework for incorporating open space, both habitat and recreation, into water management project design features" and "to provide a framework for the GLAC Region's water and land managers to assist in the development of integrated projects for funding through the IRWMP." We agree that this should be the goal/objective of the OSHARP. However, the following sentence refers to this effort as a "resulting standalone plan that, although develop for IRWMP, does not necessarily need to be applied solely to IRWMP." We disagree that OSHARP is or should be considered a "standalone" plan. It was not intended as such, nor should it be used as such. The members of the Leadership Committee or Steering Committees are not the primary open space or park managers of the region, and we should not purport to set goals in areas that are beyond our authority. The sentence quoted above should be deleted. Instead, a sentence should be added here that states "The habitat and recreation goals for the GLAC IRWMP reflect the best available information but are based on numerous assumptions and are subject to change as better information about the potential for actual implementation, including information about the cost of attaining the targets, is developed and vetted at the Subregional level." b. The paragraph under the heading "Evaluating Open Space Projects" should be deleted. The scoring metric was never vetted by everyone and it is not clear how this scoring metric relates to other approaches to evaluate and score proposed projects. It should be kept as a draft for future consideration and development.	Edits Incorporated
ae28	6/27/2013	same as above	4. Section 12.3 Recommendations: The Recommendations section should be reorganized and edited for clarity and a few recommendations should be deleted. We will propose revisions to the text for the Plan Update Committee's consideration.	Edits Incorporated
ae29	6/27/2013	same as above	5. The Leadership Committee intended the Habitat and Open Space (and Recreation) analysis to not result in a standalone plan, but rather, a Technical Memorandum. Therefore, globally delete all references to the word/sense of the document being a "Plan" throughout the IRWMP, and in all appendices/exhibits, and instead refer to the document as a Technical Memorandum.	Edits Incorporated
ae30	6/27/2013	same as above	6. Delete Appendices (Exhibits) H and I from the Habitat Open Space and Recreation Technical Memo, and all references to them within the Technical Memorandum. This evaluation is outside the scope of the Leadership Committee's direction to the HOSP Ad Hoc Committee, and was not current practice in evaluating projects for GLAC's Proposition 84, Round 2 implementation grant application.	Edits Incorporated
ae31	6/27/2013	same as above	7. The primary direction given by the Leadership Committee in approving the planning grant application scope of work for the development of the Habitat Open Space and Recreation Technical Memo was that it describe the benefits of open space, habitat, and recreation projects to water management ("IRWMP") projects. The table of contents indicate tha 5 pages (67-71) are devoted to this topic, and Appendix (Exhibit G) is referenced. However, no backup is given in either location for the numbers developed in Table 13 on page 67, or Table 14 on page 70. It isn't clear that this work is fully developed.	Edits Incorporated
ae32	6/27/2013	same as above	Water Supply Technical Memorandum In comparing the values in the Water Supply TM to the values in each of the subregional plans, it appears that adding the Table 3 water supply targets (from the WS TM) to the 2010 current supply shown in the corresponding Tables 1 and 2 (from the subregional plans), the numbers don't always add up to be the values shown in the 2035 column in Table 1 from the subregional plan. These discrepancies either need to be 1) resolved and corrected numbers edited in where appropriate, or 2) left unresolved, but fully explained in both the subregional plans and the TMs, so that all readers of the IRWMP can clearly see a) that differences exist, and b) why the differences exists.	Edits Incorporated
ae33	6/27/2013	same as above	South Bay, LLA/SG and USG/RH Subregional Plans Section 4.1 GLAC IRWM Integration Process and Tools and the section on the Potential Benefits Geodatabase: We agree that the tools that have been developed can be useful for identifying the opportunities (as discussed in the text), but we still need to be mindful that agencies and other entities actually working in these areas work together all the time and have done many collaborative projects, so we are not starting from scratch by any means. For instance in the USGRH and LLASG subregions, the whole system of flood management, conservation of local water supply, and recreation is a longstanding set of activities and facilities that represents collaboration and integration between the County Flood Control District, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Water Replenishment District, other water agencies, the Sanitation Districts, LA County Dept of Parks & Recreation and others. This set of facilities & activities isn't even mentioned in either this subregion's or the LLASG subregion's chapters. Projects that seek to enhance or extend that existing set of activities should be encouraged, because often they will be the most cost-effective, plus many partnerships already exist. Another concern is that this report should highlight partnership opportunities and opportunities for integration that the entities working in the subregions have identified, and not just have the whole IRWMP depend on theoretical opportunities that a model identifies.	Edits Incorporated
ae34	6/27/2013	same as above	USG/RH Subregional Plan Page 40, Section 4.2 Main San Gabriel Basin Water Quality and Basin Recharge: As a case in point, the description under this heading appears to ignore the extensive system already in existence, and it also does not acknowledge the extensive feasibility studies that have already occurred and/or are underway to extend the use of recycled water for groundwater recharge in both the Central Basins and Main San Gabriel Basins. These are collaborative efforts between WRD & LACSD (for the Central Basin) and USGVMWD & LACSD (for the Main SG Basin).  Page 41, Six Basins/Puente Basin Area Supply and Quality Improvement: We are not sure what this paragraph refers to, but LACSD has worked with water supplies in this area such as Walnut Valley Water District and Rowland Water District (and many others) for years to supply recycled water to them as they develop their projects. If the consultant doesn't already have LACSD's annual report, which includes an update on the progress of the development of future projects with our water agency partners (virtually every recycled water project in our service area is done in partnership with one or more water agencies), we would be happy to provide this report to RMC.	Edits Incorporated
ae35	6/27/2013	same as above	LLA/SG Subregional Plan Figure 7 in the LLA/SG Subregional Plan (and perhaps corresponding maps in other subregions?) incorrectly identifies the "Joint Water Pollution Control Plant" as the "Carson Regional WRF". Please revise the name to read "Joint Water Pollution Control Plant".	Edits Incorporated

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses  
12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
ae36	6/27/2013	same as above	Climate Change We are still reviewing the incorporation of previous comments on this topic, which were disbursed throughout the IRWMP. In general, we'd like to see the climate change recommendations in the IRWMP be limited to "common sense" approaches, such as in dry years conserve We will provide comments through the Plan Update Committee process, as needed.	Edits Incorporated
af1	NA	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	Various edits within sections of Plan. Provided as part of Plan Update Committee meetings.	NA
ag1	6/24/2013	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	Page 1-5 - "14 rubber dams" should be changed to "17 rubber dams"	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. Edits Incorporated
ag2	6/24/2013	same as above	Page 1-6 - "3 seawater barriers" should be changed to "3 seawater barriers comprised of over 290 injection wells"	Edits Incorporated
ag3	6/24/2013	same as above	Page 1-19 - There are words behind the picture	Edit Noted
ag4	6/24/2013	same as above	Page 1-23 - "The five draft Subregional Plans were developed from input received from stakeholders at regularly scheduled Subregional Steering Committee meetings held from 2011 through 2012"; Some Spelling errors in the document - Spell check everything before finalizing	Edit Noted
ag5	6/24/2013	same as above	Page 2-30 - Under Recycled water the following sentence did not make sense: "Supplies are conveyed through systems the local wholesale and/or retail water purveyors for delivery to the end users located in their respective service areas."	Edit Noted
ag6	6/24/2013	same as above	Page 2-30 - Under Stormwater Capture and use it states "Solutions such as rain barrels and cisterns would allow for the collection of stormwater for either direct use or infiltration. Water purveyors in the Region do not currently capture stormwater for direct use, but according to 2010 Urban Water Management Plans, expect to implement projects to equal 25,000 AFY. According to 2010 Urban Water Management Plans, the water purveyors in the Region plan on increasing stormwater recharge from 190,000 AFY to 215,000 AFY", how will this increased stormwater capture be measured?	Comment Noted
ag7	6/24/2013	same as above	Page 2-31 - It states "LACFCD oversees several surface water storage facilities, which were created to improve flood protection and store runoff for subsequent release and diversion to 27 spreading grounds for groundwater recharge. An additional nine spreading grounds are owned and operated by non-LACFCD entities in the Region." I'm aware of Sierra Madre, Fish Canyon, Thompson Creek and Tujunga Spreading Grounds. Arroyo Seco is in the planning stages still and Headworks S.G. is no longer used. What are the other spreading grounds?	Comment Noted
ag8	6/24/2013	same as above	Page 2-31 - It states "The Region's spreading grounds are used to recharge local surface water in addition to imported water and recycled water. LACFCD has estimated that current recharge of local surface water is 226,000 AFY, and could potentially be increased by another 342,000 AFY to offset imported water recharge." More realistic numbers from records over the past decade indicate that stormwater capture is 220,000 Acre-Feet / Year. Historic averages are more like 180,000 Acre-Feet / Year. The increase in stormwater capture should be qualified with a statement such as "during very wet years" so there isn't the expectation that 600,000 AF of stormwater, or even recycled water, can be captured every year.	Comment Noted
ag9	6/24/2013	same as above	Page 3-7 - "Stormwater runoff if a largely underutilized resource within the region. The Region's highly urbanized areas generate a large amount of runoff during winter storms that is only partially captured for direct use or to recharge local aquifers. However, this supply is very seasonal and so it is often infeasible to construct and operate facilities to store larger amounts of surface water supplies, so much of the winter storm flows are lost to the ocean. It is possible to capture urban runoff for direct use through the implementation of both small, decentralized projects as well as storage reservoirs." In the first sentence "if" should be "is"...How can decentralized stormwater capture be measured with any accuracy to determine if the 27,000 AFY is being achieved? Will this result in less flow at the spreading grounds?	Comment Noted
ag10	6/24/2013	same as above	Page 4-4 - "Considering the vast supply of seawater available to coastal regions and the demand for "new" drinking water, seawater desalination presents a promising a new option for the Region's water supply"; too many "a"s in this sentence.	Edit Noted
ag11	6/24/2013	same as above	Page 4 -8 - "Los Angeles County operates and maintains three seawater intrusion barrier systems along the coast that rely upon recycled water and imported water to reduce the intrusion of saline water in underground aquifers"; the statement "comprised of over 290 injection wells" should be added to "three seawater intrusion barrier systems".	Edit Incorporated
ag12	6/24/2013	same as above	Page 5 -17 - This shows up again on Page 5 -19: "C. Intra-Regional Raymond Basin Water Supply and Quality The Raymond Basin and the City of Pasadena are divided between the Upper Los Angeles River and Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo Subregions. This provides intra-regional opportunities between the Upper LA and Upper SG & RH Subregions for replenishment of the Raymond Basin to benefit both regions through both stormwater capture and accessing recycled water supplies from the Los Angeles-Glendale Water Reclamation Plant. This area also has been identified as a high priority drainage for achieving water quality benefits and therefore multiple-benefits project opportunities. Partnerships between the City of Pasadena, other Raymond Basin pumpers, LACSD and LACFCD could result in very beneficial integrated projects."	Edit Noted
ah1	NA	Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster	Various edits within sections of Plan. Provided as part of Plan Update Committee meetings.	NA
ai1	NA	Maria Kennedy	Various edits within sections of Plan. Provided as part of Plan Update Committee meetings.	NA
aj1	7/22/2013	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Chapter 2 comments Previous Metropolitan comments were not incorporated: 1. Page 2-27, Groundwater, 1st Paragraph, 3rd Sentence should be modified as follows: "Exceptions are the Orange County Basin, Santa Monica Basin and Hollywood Basin." 2. Page 2-28, State Water Project, 2nd Paragraph, 2nd Sentence should be modified as follows: "However, MWD projects dry year supply from the SWP of 430,000 AFY, and average deliveries of 1.2 million AFY."	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. Edits Incorporated.
aj2	7/22/2013	same as above	Chapter 5 comments 3. Table 5-3 should include a column for Primary Benefit Category. It would also be helpful to include the same symbols as in Table 5-2. 4. Map 5-7 to Map 5-11. It might be helpful to include the same symbols as in Table 5-2 for the symbols in these maps.	Edits Incorporated.
aj3	7/22/2013	same as above	Chapter 6 comments 5. Table 6-1. It is important to note that a local project does not increase the availability of imported water from either the SWP or the Colorado River. Metropolitan delivers all available water to meet demands or to storage depending upon demands during the year. Local project can increase Metropolitan's flexibility to deliver water to storage or other areas within its service area when needed. The following revision to the Potential Benefits Column is suggested: • Increased flexibility to manage available Bay-Delta and Colorado River supplies and/or environmental flows to meet demand or storage needs • Improved air quality through decreased GHG emissions if water is delivered to storage • Decreased energy consumption for water treatment and conveyance when delivered to storage	Edits Incorporated.
ak1	7/31/2013	National Park Service	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 1: Figure 1: Please include the LA/Ventura County boundary to indicate why the drainages in the upper reaches of Malibu Creek Watershed are absent in the NSMB polygon. It would be helpful to also illustrate the drainages in the upper reaches of the watershed.	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. Edits incorporated and comments noted.
ak2	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 2: Section 2.1 needs a subsection on "Public Parkland and Recreation". The public parkland and recreation use within the NSMB subregion is a defining feature of this area and needs a description paragraph along with Political Boundaries, climate information, and the geography description. Within the 153,250-acre legislative boundary of Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, 55% of the land ownership is public parkland and other publicly protected open space, including the beaches and a 500-mile public recreational trail network. SMMNRA recreational visitation is approximately 33 million visitors annually. The public parkland and protected open space provide water quality protection through maintaining native habitat cover and associated resource services, such as rainfall infiltration and absorption of non-point source pollution from local roadways and other impermeable surfacing. The parkland agencies' natural resource education programs, as part of the mission of the national recreation area, educate the public about the importance of protecting and conserving water resources. The public trail network provides for the physical and emotional rejuvenation of many visitors who live in the highly urbanized areas of greater Los Angeles.	NPS comments were incorporated in a new section titled "Public Parklands and Recreation."
ak3	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 3: Figure 2: The title should be "Cities and Communities in the Subregion". This is because Lake Sherwood, Oak Park, and Topanga are not incorporated cities; they are communities within unincorporated Ventura County (Lake Sherwood and Oak Park) and Los Angeles (Topanga). It would also be helpful to include the LA/Ventura County line.	Edits Incorporated
ak4	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 5: Figure 3: Drawing the "Subregions" symbol over the "Watersheds" symbol would improve the clarity of this figure. It's under the "Watersheds" symbol now, making it hard to see the blue outline.	Edits Incorporated
ak5	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 6: Figure 4: The legend for this map seems to indicate that all the natural streams are part of the "storm drainage system". NPS recommends using a different color to clearly show storm drains versus natural streams. The NSMB subregion is 55% parkland, and vastly composed of open space with natural streams. This subregional plan needs to reflect this unique setting compared to the other GLAC subregions.	Edits Incorporated
ak6	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 6: Figure 4: This map also, like Figure 1, does not show the drainages in the upper reaches of Malibu Creek Watershed, including Palo Comado Creek, Cheeseboro Creek, and Las Virgenes Creek. These creeks are the headwaters of this subregion and should be illustrated. Figure 10 correctly illustrates all the waterways.	Edits Incorporated
ak7	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 13: Surface Water Quality paragraph: We recommend editing the first sentence to read "The watersheds in the North Santa Monica Bay Subregion serve many beneficial uses including: recreation (trails, swimming, picnicking, fishing, outdoor education programs, etc.), and habitat (aquatic and terrestrial wildlife).	Edits Incorporated
ak8	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 18: Section 2.7.1 Wetlands: This section only mentions the larger tidal wetlands of Malibu Lagoon and Topanga Lagoon. NSMB subregion includes other small, coastal wetland systems that are more brackish, including Zuma and Trancas Lagoons. These wetlands should be included in the plan.	Edits Incorporated
ak9	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 20: Section 2.7.2 Riparian Habitat: Given the importance of riparian habitat to water quality and the potential for excellent projects in this habitat type, this section should contain a more comprehensive discussion of the many natural waterways in this subregion, not just the few that are mentioned here. The LARWQCB publication "State of the Watershed: Santa Monica Bay Watershed Management Area", dated Nov 2011, has extensive information and photos of the various streams in this subregion starting on page 94, along with a table of beneficial uses. This information could be used to improve this section of the plan. The report can be found at: <a href="http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb4/water_issues/programs/regional_program/wmi/ws_santamonica.shtml">http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb4/water_issues/programs/regional_program/wmi/ws_santamonica.shtml</a>	Information from the Regional Board's State of the Watershed report was incorporated into section 2.7.2
ak10	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 21: Section 2.7.3 Santa Monica Mountains: A map should be included showing the boundaries of the SMM National Recreation Area and land use types including public open space. NPS can provide GIS data layers of the legislative boundary and the public landownership.  This section should also include a discussion of the recreational usage, number of visitors per year, origins of visitors. NPS can provide this information.	A new map showing the spatial relation between the SMM-NRA and the NSMB subregion has been added as Figure 11.

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses  
12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
ak11	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 21: Section 2.7.3 Santa Monica Mountains: In order to more correctly reflect the scale of public landownership, we suggest the second sentence in the second paragraph be revised as follows: "Preservation of lands within the mountains are managed by California State Parks, National Park Service, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and Mountains Recreation & Conservation Authority, Mountains Restoration Trust, Los Angeles County, and municipal agencies."  The last sentence in the second paragraph should be revised as follows: "Those in the Subregion include three State Parks: Malibu Creek State Park, Topanga State Park, Leo Carrillo State Park; National Park Service lands in Cheeseboro, Palo Comado, Zuma/Trancas and Solstice Canyons, and Paramount and Peter Strauss Ranches; Santa Monica Mountains/Mountains Recreation & Conservation Authority parks: Upper Las Virgenes Canyon Open Space Preserve, Ed Edelman/Summit Valley Park, Tuna Canyon Park, and Corral Canyon Park; Mountains Restoration Trust-owned Cold Creek Preserve; and City of Malibu's Charmlee Wilderness Park."	Edits Incorporated
ak12	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 21: Section 2.7.3 Santa Monica Mountains: Acreage of the SMMNRA is 153,250 acres.	Edits Incorporated
ak13	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 22: Section 2.7.5 SEAs and ESHAs: Reorganize this section to list the SEA names with the SEA discussion. Also, we recommend mentioning Los Angeles County's efforts underway to re-map SEAs throughout Los Angeles County.  More extensive discussion on ESHAs is needed, including a reference that the incomplete Malibu LUP (1986) is the source of ESHA locations at this time. The description of specific ESHA areas should acknowledge that, within the City of Malibu, nearly all remaining open space is designated ESHA under the Malibu Local Coastal Program (LCP). The plan should also note the status of Los Angeles County's Santa Monica Mountains LCP: the Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan have been approved by the County, and the County is now in negotiations with Coastal Commission about designating ESHA in this LCP.	Edits Incorporated
ak14	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 23-24: To improve the clarity of the document, there should be an ESHA map between the SEA map and the ASBS map. Please add one.	nstead, both ESHAs and SEAs were incorporated into a single map, Figure 12.
ak15	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 25: Section 2.7.7 Marine Habitat: The two-sentence introductory statement should be expanded to more fully describe the nature of the Santa Monica Bay marine ecosystem, i.e. descriptions of kelp bed locations, tide pools, marine species typical of the area, etc.  This section should be reorganized to have "Marine Protected Areas" as the first sub-section, followed by SMBRC's Marine Program, and then a sub-section for Heal the Bay and other non-profit organizations devoted to protected marine life and water quality. There are many organizations in addition to Heal the Bay that contribute to data-gathering and protection/preservation of water quality in the Santa Monica Mountains and Bay.	The introductory was expanded as suggested. Reference to Heal the Bay was removed in order to not exclude other monitoring organizations.
ak16	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 27: Section 2.8 Open Space and Recreation: This section needs to acknowledge that nearly 500 miles of public recreational trails are used heavily by visitors from the GLAC region. Additionally, there are numerous education programs for school children during the week. Every weekend there are several agency-sponsored and non-profit group outdoor education and recreation programs. Program participant counts and visitation estimates are available if needed. The percentage of protected land within SMMNRA should be revised to 55%.	Edits Incorporated
ak17	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 27: Section 2.9 Land Use: The second sentence should be revised to change "conservancy plans" to "public parklands". The source for the categories of land use described in this section should be identified as from state, county, or city planning documents.  Table 5, listing the percentage breakdown of Land Use Type, states that "Vacant" land use is 89% of the total land base, while "Open Space/Recreation" is just 1%. This breakdown of land use is not consistent with previous statements of 55% protected open space and parkland. These figures do not reflect that at least 55% of the land base within SMMNRA is used for public recreation. Additionally, "Vacant" does not adequately describe the natural, cultural, scenic, and recreational values provided by this undeveloped land. NPS requests this table be re-worked to clearly define "Vacant" and "Open Space/Recreation" and to adjust the percentage breakdown for these categories.	Edits Incorporated
ak18	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 29: Figure 13: This map of Parks and Protected Open Space Areas needs to be completely re-worked. • The map incorrectly illustrates "Existing Trails" and falls far short by showing a few proposed trail routes and almost none of the 500-mile public trail network. • Areas of "Developed Urban Park and Recreation Area" are incorrectly identified: Camp 13, for example, is a County prison camp, and Malibu Lagoon should not be considered a developed urban park. "Open Space Area" should be identified as "Protected Parkland and Open Space". • Also, the map is missing recent public parkland acquisitions. NPS can provide current trail and protected open space GIS data layers.	Edits Incorporated
ak19	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 30: Figure 14: This map of Critical Habitat needs to include Critical Habitat for the federally listed endangered tidewater goby and southern steelhead trout.	Edits Incorporated
ak20	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 31: Figure 15: This Land Use map that corresponds with Table 5 (see Comment No. 17) incorrectly illustrates "Vacant" land and "Open Space/Recreation" and should be corrected to reflect the 55% of the land base that is public parkland and protected open space.	Edits Incorporated
ak21	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 36: Figure 16: NPS understands this geodatabase map is at an early stage. Future updates for the NSMB subregion would include more adequately labeling the "Habitat: Historical and Current Terrestrial Aquatic" category, and should comprehensively illustrate SEAs and ESHAs; these should be in addition to, not in place of wetland / stream data.  Also, for SMMNRA, the "Recreation: High Priority" overlay illustrates almost no area, yet SMMNRA features 500 miles of public trails, along with beaches, campgrounds, and the new Visitor Center at King Gillette Ranch. The Open Space for Habitat and Recreation Plan (OSHR Plan, Appendix H of the GLAC IRWMP) identifies Proposed County Trail Routes (indicated as High Priority) in Figure 13 of that document. There are many of these shown in the NSMB Subregion. However, these are not reflected in the map shown in Figure 16. NPS would like to know why were these trails not included in the geodatabase analysis when identifying multi-benefit opportunities. Inclusion of the public trails would have resulted in far more area identified as high priority for recreation targets than is currently indicated.  Footnotes 4 and 5 in Table 7 on Page 37 indicate that SEAs were used because there was no similar data to C. Rairdan 1998 available for this subregion. This has resulted in Figure 16 showing no streamlines for the NSMB subregion, which doesn't make sense. At least include streamlines as shown in the Open Space for Habitat and Recreation Plan for consistency.	Edit Incorporated
ak22	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 37: "4.1 4.2 Integration Opportunities in North Santa Monica...". (There was already a section 4.1 starting on page 35)	Section numbering has been corrected.
ak23	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 37: Section 4.1 Integration Opportunities in NSMB: The first bullet greatly underestimates the recreation and open space value the NSMB subregion provides to the overall GLAC region. The bullet states "There is the least need for recreation and open space." We understand this is in comparison to the other four GLAC subregions, some of which include Los Angeles, a city renowned for having a very low parks to people ratio. However, this bullet's statement is a simplistic summary that portrays a skewed picture. We find the bullet should be revised to say "There is the least need for new recreation and open space to serve residents compared to the other GLAC subregions", given the extensive existing parkland and public recreational opportunities. However, this bullet should acknowledge that SMMNRA and the NSMB play a critical role in providing public recreation for the areas of greater Los Angeles that do not have adequate parkland. For example, the park agencies' programs provide outdoor recreation opportunities for thousands of school children in under-served communities each year. There are numerous programs that also educate children about where their water supply comes from and the importance of conserving water. Additionally, protection, enhancement, and restoration of this subregion's existing open space are recognized as having great significance for the entire GLA region."	Edit Incorporated
ak24	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 38: First bullet point on the page should read: "There are less fewer concrete streambeds..."	Edit Incorporated
ak25	7/31/2013	same as above	NSMB Subregional Plan - Pg. 38 and 39: Figure 17 and subsequent discussion: The map has Areas A, B, D, and E. Is there an Area C?	Edit Incorporated
ak26	7/31/2013	same as above	Section 4: General - The relationship between the Open Space for Habitat and Recreation (OSHR) Plan (Appendix H of the GLAC IRWMP) and the NSMB Subregional plan is not clear. The Subregional plan should explain how the various considerations in the OSHR Plan apply in this subregion and how they contribute to identifying priority multi-benefit project areas as discussed in Section 4.	Edit Incorporated
ak27	7/31/2013	same as above	Appendices: The plan does not include Appendix B, C, D or E. NPS is, therefore, unable to provide comments on these components of the NSMB Subregional Plan.	Comment Noted
ak28	7/31/2013	same as above	General: This subregional plan needs to incorporate more detailed discussion of NSMB's many attributes with respect to the considerations identified in the Open Space for Habitat and Recreation Plan, including biodiversity.	Edits Incorporated
al1	NA	Rivers and Mountains Conservancy	Various edits within sections of Plan. Provided as part of Plan Update Committee meetings.	NA
am1	5/14/2013	Rosanna Abou-Diab	As a concerned homeowner all I would like to know if there are any changes that will impact me financially. Can someone clear this up for me, thanks	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. There are no direct impacts to individual homeowners anticipated from the development of the GLAC IRWMP. This Plan is developed in response to a grant funding opportunity, and as such, is atypical of most planning efforts, since the document is developed in the spirit of cooperation, rather than to exercise legal authority.
an1	NA	San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority	Various edits within sections of Plan. Provided as part of Plan Update Committee meetings.	NA
ao1	5/14/2013	Thomas Duket	I didn't go through all the material available but I hope the issue of FRACKING is up for discussion. The practice has already shown to be detrimental to ground water in the central valley. Fracking is taking place now in the Baldwin Hills oil fields. Cheap oil (much of which is being shipped abroad) is not worth the loss of our food and water resources. We live in a semi-arid climate. Ground water is gold here.	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. Please see response ab26.
ap1	6/17/2013	Topanga Creek Watershed Committee	Pg. J-20: Original Text: Although yet to be identified, there are several potential sources for high bacteria counts including poorly maintained septic systems (all 4,500 homes and commercial buildings in the watershed are on septic systems), graywater systems, and corralled animals. Suggested Text: Although yet to be identified, there are several potential sources for high bacteria counts in Topanga Lagoon. These include both natural sources (such as birds and other wildlife) and anthropogenic sources (such as homeless encampments and commercial septic systems in the lower watershed). The spatial patterns of bacteria detected in Topanga Creek above the lagoon suggest that bacteria from potential upper watershed sources are cleansed downstream as water in the creek cascades through lower Topanga State Park. Comment: The wording of the original text implicates septic systems in the upper watershed as a major contributor to high bacteria levels occurring in Topanga Lagoon. Whereas, recent studies by UCLA with the Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains suggest that current methods of domestic wastewater management the upper watershed is not having any significant impact on Topanga Lagoon bacteria levels.1	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. The Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains is currently conducting a bacteria source identification study in the Topanga Creek Watershed for Los Angeles County with an expected completion date of 2014.

Greater Los Angeles County Region IRWM Plan Update 2013 Public Comments and Responses  
12/2/2013

Comment ID	Date	Entity	Comment	Response
aq1	6/20/2013	Upper San Gabriel River and Rio Hondo Subregion Steering Committee	Appendix M, Pg. 7: Delete sentence that water is available 3 of 10 years.	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. Comment noted.
aq2	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix M, Pg.7: Several UWMPs were not included, most notably SGVMWD's and UD's UWMP's.	Edits Incorporated
aq3	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix M, Pg. 8: Table 1 does not accurately reflect all groundwater production. The Main Basin groundwater production is currently about 220,000 acre-feet. In addition there needs to be water production for other Basins including 25,000 acre-feet from Raymond basin plus water rights in Six Basins and Puente Basin. The accuracy of the 2035 projections could not be verified, but can be back calculated by gpcd demand and projected increased population by 2035 and adding that value to the 2010 demand.	Edits Incorporated
aq4	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix M, Pg. 8: Table 2 – Untreated imported water is about 44,000 (not 38,000) and will need to be increased as of 2035 based on increased population.	Edits Incorporated
aq5	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix M, Pg. 11: Rubber dams are not part of flood management; they are deflated during storms.	Edits Incorporated
aq6	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix M, Pg. 11: The Rio Hondo is a distributary of the San Gabriel River and as such is also fully appropriated down to the L.A. River.	Edits Incorporated
aq7	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix M, Pg. 11: Delete "the only water agency." Azusa Light and Water and Covina Irrigating Company also use the S.G. River water for direct use.	Edits Incorporated
aq8	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix M, Pg. 17: The Demand projections on Table 5 should be increased significantly. Total demand from the Main Basin (including treated imported water) is about 250,000 acre-feet and about 50,000 for Raymond Basin. Six Basins and Puente Basin should also be included.	Comments Addressed
aq9	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix M, Pg. 22: Clarification added for the rolls of Watermaster and WQA in the Main Basin.	Comments Addressed
aq10	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix E, Pg. 2: See comments to Appendix M...ground water supply is significantly understated. Revise Table 1	Comments Addressed
aq11	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix E, Pg. 3: Table 2, footnote 2: There is no seawater barrier recharge in the subregion. Please remove last sentence.	Comments Addressed
aq12	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix E, Pg. 9: Table 11. Future pumping in excess of a producers water right is subject to an equal amount of Replacement water deliveries. The past 10-year average (about 235,000 AF) should be used as a baseline and then use population increases to project future pumping/demand.	Comments Noted
aq13	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix E., Pg 11: A factor of 21 AFY/square mile based data from the City of Los Angeles was applied to the San Gabriel/Rio Hondo region. The hydrology of the two watersheds is different. Estimates/projections provided by the LACFCD staff should be used; otherwise this value should be considered as 0 until better data is developed	Comment Noted
aq14	6/20/2013	same as above	Chapter 3: Wastewater should be included in the Objectives.	Wastewater was added to the "Improve Water Quality" objective.
aq15	6/20/2013	same as above	Appendix M, Section 2.4 Groundwater Quality  Groundwater quality in the San Gabriel Basin (which includes all basins discussed in the Groundwater Supply section except for Raymond Basin and Six Basins) is managed by the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster (WQAWatermaster) under its authority from the court. The Watermaster administers the Main San Gabriel Basin Judgment and enforces its provisions which establish water rights and responsibility for management of quantity and quality of the groundwater. They review and adopt their "Five-Year Water Quality and Supply Plan" each year. In addition, the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority (WQA) was created by the state legislature to promote improvement of groundwater quality in the San Gabriel Basin. Their basin wide groundwater quality management and remediation plan is reviewed and adopted annually. The WQA reviews and adopts a basin-wide groundwater quality management and remediation plan on an annual basis. This plan includes all projects that the WQA is facilitating, and identifies various funding sources to ensure full funding for each project. The San Gabriel Valley's groundwater basin has water quality issues across the basin that are being addressed by WQA projects with a focus on 1) accelerating removal of contaminant mass in the basin, 2) preventing migration of contamination into critical groundwater supplies, 3) integrating cleanup with water supply, and 4) minimizing economic impact to the public.	Edit incorporated
ar1	6/27/2013	Water Replenishment District	Pg. 1-8: Figure 1-3 (inside box), Misspelled word: process	Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Draft GLAC IRWMP update 2013. Edit incorporated.
ar2	6/27/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-8: Milestones Accomplishments (third picture): Misspelled word: proeft	Edit incorporated
ar3	6/27/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-14: No committee members listed under "Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River"	Edit incorporated
ar4	6/27/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-16: Second paragraph, line 3 and 4 Extra word: provide more a more dynamic	Edit incorporated
ar5	6/27/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-23: 1.9 Technical Analysis Extra space at the beginning of the paragraph and an extra word on the second to last line: of the of the Plan Update	Edit incorporated
ar6	6/27/2013	same as above	Pg. 1-2: Map 1-1 Misspelled word: Jocinto	Edit incorporated
ar7	6/27/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-3: Lower SG/LA Rivers Characteristics: 2nd paragraph 1st sentence ...due to recharge basins at the Whittier Narrows.	Edit incorporated
ar8	6/27/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-13: Map 2-3(e) Be consistent in referring to California Water Served Company.	Comment Noted
ar9	6/27/2013	same as above	Pg. 2-30: Stormwater Capture and Use: 1st paragraph 2nd sentence A majority of stormwater ...channeled to ocean. Confirm with LACDPW: statement seems to be in conflict with their latest stormwater conservation numbers (i.e. -90% of water is captured).	Comment Noted
ar10	6/27/2013	same as above	Pg. 3-3: Improve Water Supply: 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence. Recharge or direct reuse of runoff from urbanize areas is generally limited by concerns about the presence of contaminants. Direct reuse of runoff from urbanized areas... Incorrect statement. Recharge of this water is maximized by the FCD.	Edit incorporated
ar11	6/27/2013	same as above	Pg. 4-4: Water Supply-Desalination: 5th paragraph, 1st sentence ...such as the Goldsworthy Desalter... such as WRD's Goldsworthy Desalter...	Edit incorporated
ar12	6/27/2013	same as above	Pg. 4-5: Figure 4-2 Increase recharge of treated stormwater Increase stormwater recharge Current and proposed projects to recharge stormwater do not necessarily have a treatment component. Treatment occurs through Soil Aquifer Treatment (SAT) as the water percolates.	Edit incorporated
as1	NA	West Basin Municipal Water District	Various edits within sections of Plan. Provided as part of Plan Update Committee meetings.	NA